The Beautiful Delusion of an Atheist

"Notes in Critique of the Book The God Delusion, and Other Important Books by Richard Dawkins"

Written by:

Daniel Akhondi

Note to the Reader

This English abstract, along with the keywords, do not appear in the original Persian edition of the book.

Abstract

This book, *The Beautiful Delusion of an Atheist*, serves as a comprehensive philosophical and theological critique of the arguments presented by Richard Dawkins, particularly in his seminal work, *The God Delusion*, as well as his other writings and debates. The critique systematically deconstructs Dawkins's central arguments by first establishing essential theological and philosophical premises often misrepresented or overlooked in the New Atheist discourse. The author argues that Dawkins's primary error lies in his "theological delusion," which includes a flawed anthropomorphic conception of God, a fundamental misunderstanding of the relationship between science and religion, and a failure to distinguish between proofs for God's existence and proofs for God's attributes. A key philosophical principle, "the negation of the evidence does not imply the negation of the proven," is employed to demonstrate that even if all arguments for God were refuted, the non-existence of God would not be established. The critique contrasts the "God of the gaps" with a novel concept of "atheism of the gaps. Furthermore, it distinguishes between a "Personal God" and an "Impersonal God," clarifying that Dawkins's rejection is aimed primarily at the former, a conception which many theists themselves do not accept. The critique also delves into the limitations of science in addressing metaphysical questions, the fallacies in Dawkins's reasoning (such as misapplying biological concepts to philosophy), and the absolutist and polemical nature of his arguments, ultimately contending that his work fails to provide a coherent or sufficient refutation of God's existence.

Keywords: Richard Dawkins, The God Delusion, Atheism, Philosophy of Religion, Islamic Philosophy, Evolutionary Biology, New Atheism, The Beautiful Delusion of an Atheist.

Author's Note

In the Persian text of this book, the author is occasionally referred to by his poetic pen name, "Ghazi." This name is a *takhallos* (pen name) of Daniel Akhondi and does not refer to any other individual.

The Beautiful Illusion of an Atheist / Written by: Daniel Adhondi — Title and Author:

Site and Instagram page: HamrahBaGhazi / Fall 2022 — Publication Details:

551 pages — Physical Description:

First Edition: November 2022 (Persian) / First English Edition: August 2026

Critique of the book The God Delusion by "Richard Dawkins" — Subject:

Book Title: The Beautiful Delusion of an Atheist

Author: Daniel Akhondi

Instagram: HamrahBaGhazi YouTube: Hamrahbaghazi

Edition: First – November 2022

Price: 99 thousand Tomans

⚠ IMPORTANT WARNING

This text has been translated by artificial intelligence and has not been reviewed or edited by the author (8/5/2026). The translation may contain lexical, syntactic, or content errors. Additionally, this includes only the first part (one-third) of the original book. If possible please compare the text with the original source.

© 2022 Daniel Akhondi. All rights reserved.

Dedicated to my dear father and mother

who gifted me freethinking and right-thinking.

Table of Contents

Introduction
Biography of Professor Richard Dawkins
Part One (Do not enter the book without this part!)
Various Beliefs About God
Who is God?
God is not like anything.
Definition of God
Who created God?
If the world was not created at some time, it does not mean that ...
Denial of the evidence does not imply denial of the proven.
Not all theists accept all the proofs for the existence of God.
Some of the proofs for the existence of God are laughable.
Some of the theists' proofs are for strengthening faith, not for proving the existence of God.
A Muslim's faith is not endangered by refuting the proofs of God's existence!
How God intervenes in the world
The God of the gaps
The atheism of the gaps
The God rejected by Dawkins
Which God?
A personal God and an impersonal God
God is not the direct creator of matter.
The proofs for the existence of God are different from the proofs for God's attributes.
The common people's conception
Definition of religion and faith
Religious absolutism
Atheism absolutism
Religious dogmatists
Definition of science
Not every word of every scientist is acceptable as science.
We accept every person in their own field of work and activity.
Evolution by natural selection
The relationship between science and religion
Intelligent design
How can science refute the existence of God?
Dawkins's mindset, thoughts, and beliefs
Nobel laureates
Dawkins's presuppositions
Theism belongs to bygone ages
Richard Dawkins's superheroes
Professor Richard Dawkins's scientific theories
The Selfish Gene
The Meme hypothesis

The Extended Phenotype
Professor Richard Dawkins's books
Part Two
The translator of The God Delusion
Introduction to The God Delusion
Dawkins's four consciousness-raising messages
A deeply religious unbeliever
Deserving of respect
Undeserved respect
The God Hypothesis
Polytheism
Monotheism
Secularism, the Founding Fathers, and America's religion
The poverty of agnosticism
NOMA
The Great Prayer Experiment
The Neville Chamberlain evolutionism school
Little Green Men
Proofs of God's existence
Thomas Aquinas's "proofs"
The Ontological Argument and other a priori arguments (from cause to effect)
The Aesthetic Argument
The Argument from Personal Experience
The Argument from Scripture
The Argument from Eminent Religious Scientists
Pascal's Wager
Bayesian arguments
Why there is almost certainly no God
The Ultimate Boeing 747
Natural Selection as a Consciousness-Raiser
Irreducible Complexity
Worship of gaps
The Anthropic Principle: Planetary Version
The Anthropic Principle: Cosmological Version
An Interlude in Cambridge
The Roots of Religion
The Darwinian Verdict
The Direct Benefits of Religion
Group Selection
Religion as a By-product of Something Else
Bewitched by Religion
Gently, softly, lest my memes crack
Cargo Cults
The Roots of Morality: Why are we good?

Does our conscience have a Darwinian origin?
A Case Study in the Origins of Morality
If there is no God, why should we be good?
And the changing ethical zeitgeist of the "good" book
The Old Testament
Is the New Testament better?
Love thy neighbour
The Ethical Zeitgeist
What about Hitler and Stalin? Weren't they atheists?
What's wrong with religion? Why all this hostility?
Fundamentalism and the destruction of science
The hidden side of absolutism
Religion and homosexuality
Religion and the sanctity of human life
The Great Beethoven Fallacy
How does "moderate" religion breed bigotry?
Childhood, Abuse, and Escape from Religion
Physical and mental abuse
In defence of children
An educational scandal
Consciousness-raising again
Religious education as part of literary heritage
A necessary vacuum?
Binker
Consolation
Intuition
The mother of all burqas
Part Three
As a final critique of The God Delusion
What would the world be like if Dawkins came to believe in God?
The reaction of philosophers and scientists to Richard Dawkins's views and The God Delusion
Books critiquing The God Delusion
Ten fundamental and repeatedly repeated mistakes
1-Science refutes the existence of God!
2-Because God is complex, He probably does not exist.
3-Because the probability of God's existence is very unlikely, therefore God does not exist!
4-Fruitless words and arguments
5-The narrow lens of one's academic field
6-Lack of sources
7-Considering theists stupid
8-There is no difference between religions!
9-Because a religious person did something bad, therefore surely ...
10-Where did natural selection come from?

Religion and terrorism
Dawkins's ethics
Richard Dawkins and Persian speakers
Final word
Notes
References

Introduction

Almost everyone who has even a slight acquaintance with biology or the New Atheism knows "Richard Dawkins." A figure who has attracted many students from various fields and enthusiasts of the latest scientific achievements. With his powerful memory and high skill in writing, he has found fans all over the world.

I don't remember exactly how I first became acquainted with him. Whether it was when I was studying his scientific theories in zoology, or when I learned about the discussions related to the New Atheism. But what has now settled in my mind was, at first glance, through topics related to the New Atheism.

Like many, I had heard the name of the best-selling book The God Delusion, written by the prominent British biologist "Professor Richard Dawkins," many times, and I never thought that — I myself! — would write a critique of this book!

The story goes back to a party to which my professor was also invited; in the last Persian century (a few months ago!). When the conversation reached prominent atheistic books, my professor, although he completely disagreed with the content of the book "Sapiens," was delighted by its writing style and impact. After a moment's reflection, he looked at me and said, what is your opinion?

At that time, I had been publishing many materials in response to the philosophical-scientific doubts of atheists and also reviewing and critiquing their views for nearly ten months, but I had not yet read the said book. However, I knew that its translated cover was white. I asked, is that the same book with the white cover?

He said: Yes;

I said: I haven't read that book yet!

My professor, who could barely suppress his laughter, continued seriously: It's not just that book, "The God Delusion" is also written very

cleverly and skillfully, and is popular among the masses. He said: You confirm that, right?

I said: I haven't read this book yet either!

With a very surprised tone he said: Really!?

I said: Yes;

He said: Then where did you gather all this material to critique!?

□□□

Of course, my professor had an astonishing mastery over internal and external religious doubts, to the extent that on some subjects he had formed his own opinions.

A few days later, when I couldn't control my excitement and curiosity, I went for The God Delusion and downloaded it. And by quickly skimming, I read the first fifteen, twenty pages and realized: this book is the main source of New Atheists, dozens of whom during these months had either asked questions in comments or asked for objections to be raised!

Yes; just as the Quran is the main source of Muslims, The God Delusion (or in other words, The God Fallacy) is also the main source of atheists. With the difference that Muslims acknowledge their reference with exact numbers and pages.

The translation of The God Delusion is 229 pages, which fit onto a full A4 page in fine print. When I decided to write a critique of it, I calculated in my mind that this is 200 pages, so the critique would be at least 400 A4 pages in very fine print. And I was very hesitant about this (because it couldn't be fully critiqued in one volume). So I wrote the critique very concisely and without full and extra elaboration (without examples and explanations) up to the fifth chapter of the book.

Then I realized that this book doesn't have much to say. Not only has he not presented any new argument, but merely through improvisation and storytelling, the number of pages has reached 200. That is, if I gather all the

useful content and arguments of Mr. Dawkins in The God Delusion, it might not even fill 40 pages!

More interesting than this is that I critiqued the entire book and my critique did not reach 60 pages!

That is, even though I fully mentioned Dawkins's arguments and then wrote the critique, it came to about 50 pages. With a font size of 20 at that! (which is relatively large for this font!)

But anyway, that's not the issue now, and I have elaborated on the matters as much as my capacity allows. Of course, to make it easier for you dear ones to read, I have intentionally typed the text in a larger font, so that if you read this book from your phone screen, it won't cause you much trouble. So do not worry at all about the large volume of the book.

Alright; let's also talk a little about the book "The God Delusion" itself. This book consists of ten chapters. The first four chapters are about distorting the reasons and proofs for the existence of God. And from the fifth chapter onward, sufficient reasons for the ineffectiveness of religions — according to the author of the book — are presented. The third and fourth chapters — the chapters on the proofs of God's existence and why there is almost certainly no God — form the most important chapters of the book. During the critiques and reviews, I will say things about the meaning of these chapters and their relationships.

□□□

This book — the book before you — I have divided into three parts:

The first part is generalities about God, science, and religion. We become acquainted with "Dawkins's theological illusion" and we will examine how the relationship between science and religion is presented. Because Mr. Dawkins has passed very superficially over topics that need more elaboration. In this section, we have quoted many of his arguments and important content from his debates, as well as from his other books.

In the second part, we examine all the arguments and reasons of Professor Dawkins in a micro-categorized manner, from the first chapter to

the end of the tenth chapter. It is worth mentioning that some of the marginal and extraneous issues he has raised do not need to be critiqued, and he himself only raised and expanded on these topics to embellish the discussion. This section directly exists in the book "The God Delusion."

And finally, in the third part, we will discuss his fundamental errors, the views and reactions that have been raised in response to this book and Mr. Dawkins personally, from both supporters and opponents, and we will talk about a few other topics.

The book before you is truly more than a simple and boring critique. In this book, I have examined almost all the views, scientific theories, and arguments of Mr. Dawkins. I have included all his other books, Dawkins's important debates with theists, and some of his articles.

The Persian version I have of "The God Delusion" has been edited by "Dr. M. Faaal." This version is available on the special Richard Dawkins website for Persian speakers (and a few other Middle Eastern languages). The page numbers I have quoted from The God Delusion correspond to this version. It is worth noting that the Persian translator of The God Delusion has in some places mistakenly translated some of Professor Richard Dawkins's views and thoughts, which I will point out in their proper place.

Some of Mr. Dawkins's arguments are wrong from various aspects. I have tried in each section to examine it from only one aspect, and in other sections, after a brief explanation of that topic, to also point out the incorrectness of those arguments from other aspects.

In the footnotes, I have written additional information, supplements, and sometimes the English equivalent of important words and phrases. I know well that this will be very useful for enthusiasts for more careful study and attention.

Due to fidelity in quotations, I have written the texts exactly as in the original text, without any manipulation or change. But in some quotations where the key word is placed in the preceding or following phrases or sentences of the narration, to convey the meaning completely and without omission, I have added that key word to the quotation with the {} sign. I have arranged the various websites and sources I have cited indirectly, by section,

in the notes section. I have also listed Mr. Dawkins's various debates with philosophers, theologians, and scientists in the references section.

And finally, I sincerely thank my professor for helping me with the scientific and literary editing of the book.

□□□

If any part of the book "The God Delusion" that was important to you escaped the scrutiny of critique, or if this book has ambiguities and errors in the selection of certain words, or if you have a critique, suggestion, opinion, or even thanks, we would be happy if you share it with us.

hamrahbaghazi2021@gmail.com

Biography of Professor Richard Dawkins

"Richard Dawkins" was born on March 26, 1941 in England. He studied zoology and is an emeritus professor at the University of Oxford. According to himself, at the age of 9, when he was becoming disbelief in God, the argument from design did not allow him to do so.

He has written many scientific books. His first book, The Selfish Gene (1976), introduced him to the scientific community. His greater fame is due to the publication of The God Delusion. I have devoted the last part of the first section to a complete introduction of his works. The God Delusion was published in 2006, and by early 2018, 3.3 million copies of the book had been sold. [Guardian, 2018] This book has been translated into almost 50 living languages of the world.

Richard Dawkins became acquainted with Darwinism at the age of 16 and realized that the complexities of living beings do not need a creator or designer, and he lost his religious faith. [Guardian, 2003]

Mr. Dawkins has given many scientific lectures and television programs and has a good ability to make biology understandable to the general public. For this reason, from 1995 to 2008, he held the Oxford "Charles Simonyi" Chair for Public Understanding of Science. [Further particulars, 2008]

Part One

(Do not enter the book without this part!)

God, Religion, and Science

The extreme hero-worship of atheists towards people like Dawkins and Harris has not only caused them to lose their critical thinking, but has also nurtured dogmatic and conservative individuals. Especially when the issue of theism is involved. [shadowtollight, 2012]

Various Beliefs About God

In general, a religious theist and an anti-religious atheist are the two ends of a spectrum. A religious theist is called a "Theist," which is a Greek word. Exactly in the middle of this spectrum is "Agnosticism." According to agnostics, there are neither strong reasons to prove God nor sufficient reasons to reject God's existence; they are indifferent to God's existence.

"Deists" are placed between agnosticism and religious theism. They are theists who do not accept religions and do not follow any religion, but believe in God. Richard Dawkins defines "Deism" as follows:

Deism is a watered-down version of theism. [The God Delusion, p19]

The opposite belief to "Deism," which lies exactly between agnosticism and anti-religious atheism, is "Agnosticism." They have evidence for the non-existence of God, but cannot judge absolutely on the non-existence of God.

At the end of the spectrum are the anti-religious atheists, or so-called "New Atheists." They believe that one must fight all religions, which are full of childish stories and superstitions, and eliminate religions from society. According to them, good reasons can be given for the non-existence of God.

"Neil deGrasse Tyson," one of the most famous contemporary astrophysicists, in a friendly discussion with Richard Dawkins, said to him: Why do you care about the beliefs of people who do not agree with you? While we live in a free society and everyone can think however they like?

In response, Mr. Dawkins, who is the greatest contemporary "New Atheist," answered:

I have always been in favor of freedom ... You and I agree that the universe began with the Big Bang, nearly 14 billion years ago. With an extraordinary story of cosmic inflation, the origin of life and evolution, which is very astonishing and wonderful. Now if people believe that the universe was invented by something superhuman, it is not only wrong but practically (this belief causes) ruining the wonder of the truth. ...

I, like you, do not want to force people to believe in what I believe. ... But I am upset that in such a world, they have these beliefs. ... I would like people to understand that the world is very wonderful. That is why I write my books. [Tyson and Dawkins on science, 2021]

So one of the reasons why most New Atheists want to fight religions and eliminate them is "consciousness-raising." As Mr. Dawkins himself wrote in the introduction to The God Delusion:

The aim of this book is consciousness-raising. [The God Delusion, p11]

In the later parts of this book, we will examine together a lot about the views of the New Atheists, and whether their views and actions can truly be called "superior consciousness."

Of course, there are other beliefs such as Pantheism (everything is God). And various types of theism and atheism that fall within this spectrum, and there is no need to examine all of them.

Who is God?

Most atheists do not have a correct understanding of God's existence, attributes, and actions. And they do not know at all the nature of God's relationship with the world. Although monotheistic theists also do not have much information about the essence of God, as the Prophet of Islam, Muhammad (PBUH) said: "We have not known You as You deserve to be known," but at least they do not accept an incorrect interpretation of the manner of creation or the meaning of God and the world.

As we all know, an incorrect understanding even in everyday and trivial matters cannot keep us from error, let alone important doctrinal issues. Therefore, our understanding and knowledge of God's existence and His relationship with creatures must not be trivial and superficial, so that we do not fall into error and misstep.

For example, Professor "Stephen Hawking," a famous contemporary British atheist physicist, has argued that:

Time did not exist before the Big Bang, and this in my view negates the possibility of a creator. Because there was no time for it to exist ... there was no time for God to create the universe in. [Brief Answers To The Big Question, p34]

His conception of God is a being within the universe, for whom time must pass in order to create something!

Hawking himself, in the same book, a few pages later says:

Because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing. [Brief Answers To The Big Question, p180]

It is strange. According to his view, the law of gravity — which only makes sense when matter exists — existed before the existence of matter (the Big Bang), so the universe comes into being from nothing (the law of gravity, which is not nothing, is something!). In other words, "the God that Hawking has an incorrect understanding of needs time to pass to create something, but the law of gravity does not need time to create something!"

Why can a blind physical force, which has no knowledge or wisdom, according to Mr. Hawking, bring into existence a world like our world, but a God who must be all-knowing and all-wise can only create something with the passage of time?!

A similar argument to Hawking's was made by Dawkins in a debate in the "New York Times" with Francis Collins, the head of the Human Genome Project:

At the moment of creation, God may have set evolution in motion, with all His knowledge of its subsequent events, and perhaps even this very debate we are having now is in God's knowledge. The fact that He can both foresee the future and give us free will is perfectly acceptable.

(Dawkins:)

I think this is a clear error. If God wanted to create the universe and humans, it seems a bit strange that He would choose such an unusual way.

That is, He began creation ten billion years ago, then waited four billion years for a human to emerge who has the capacity for worship, reading, and the other things that religious people are interested in. [God vs. Science, 2006]

Those two scientists believe that time passes over the creator of time as well.

If a film narrates fifty years of a famous person's life, does that mean that fifty years have also passed for me lounging on the couch in front of the TV?

If humans came into existence approximately three hundred thousand years ago (nearly 14 billion years after the Big Bang), does that mean God waited 14 billion years?

The one who created the laws is not necessarily bound by those laws (time and space)!

I, who have written this book, am not trapped inside this book or its words!

The incorrect conceptions of Richard Dawkins, the author of The God Delusion, regarding God are profound errors and cannot be overlooked. He has fundamentally incorrect thinking about God's existence, which we will examine more in the section "The God rejected by Dawkins" and later parts of the book.

I thought this foolish notion was only held by atheists from thousands of years ago. They say that one day a group of atheists came to Imam Ali (AS) and asked him:

Atheists: In what year was your God born?

Imam Ali: God was before history and times; there is no beginning for His existence. (He said to them) What number comes before four?

Atheists: Three.

Imam Ali: Before three?

Atheists: Two.

Imam Ali: Before two?

Atheists: One.

Imam Ali: Before one?

Atheists: There is nothing before one.

Imam Ali: When there is nothing before one, which is countable, then how can there be a beginning for the One who is Real, and that is God? Truly, He is Eternal and there is no beginning for Him. [Munazarat al-Imam Ali (AS) li ba'd al-mulhidin, 2010]

God is not like anything.

The first and most important principle that must be known about God is that God is not like anything, nor should He be!

Atheists, because every day they observe natural, artificial, or human events within a place and time, "think that the creator of nature and natural laws must also be located in a place or time to perform actions." For example, because a human cannot do or create something without the passage of time, therefore the creator of humans and the world must also be like that.

Of course, this is the same anthropomorphic God that has supporters among theists as well, and there is no need at all to argue for the refutation of the existence of this God. Because its existence is fundamentally impossible. An anthropomorphic God is a God whose attributes and characteristics resemble a human. — In the section on the personal God and the impersonal God, we will talk more about this subject. — It should be noted that God must be deemed absolutely free from creature-like descriptions and from any defect.

Definition of God

Without a correct understanding of the meaning and definition of any subject, one cannot attain understanding. Therefore, the concept of God must be clarified for us. To what being does the term God apply?

All of us have seen children around us who are just beginning to speak — this example is a favorite of some Islamic philosophers — who constantly ask their father and mother: what is this? What is that?

A child, in his childhood, perceives the difference between things around him. He constantly uses the pronouns this and that, this is his father, that is a sofa, that one is a window, and...

These things are philosophically called "existence." Something that exists is either "Necessary Existence" or "Possible Existence."

The existence of that child's father, or the sofa, is in need of another existence. They need something that has brought them into existence. In philosophy, existences that are in need of another existence are called "Possible Existence." According to Avicenna, the greatest Islamic philosopher, "Possible Existence" is an existence that may exist or may not exist:

If existence or non-existence is not necessary for the essence of that being, it is called Possible Existence. [Al-Ilahiyat al-Shifa, p37]

The same applies to our example's father, sofa, and window, and to all existences. Our house, our city, our country, the Earth, and finally the entire universe.

When all the things we see in the world are "Possible Existence," that means the world, as the collection of all these possible existences, is also a Possible Existence and is in need of a cause for its existence.

Necessary Existence means an existence that is not in need of any other existence. [Dehkhoda Dictionary] and it is the most perfect, the highest, and the best existence (it exists by itself).

The Chief Master, Abu Ali Sina, in his last book, argues that:

1) When we look at the beings of this world, we understand that these beings are essentially Possible Existence.

2) A Possible Existence does not have the ability to come into being by itself and needs a Necessary Existence to come into being.

Consequently: The beings of this world are dependent on a Necessary Existence in itself, which has brought them from a state of non-being into existence. [Derived from Al-Isharat wa al-Tanbihat]

Who created God?

In the section on Richard Dawkins's superheroes, I have pointed out the significant role and influence of "Bertrand Russell," the English philosopher and mathematician, on Dawkins's views and ideas. Two of Mr. Dawkins's compatriots have greatly influenced his thinking. Russell, in one of his books, finds no answer to the question of who created God. He says:

I must say, when I was young, ... for a long time I accepted the first-cause argument, until one day at the age of 18, when I was reading John Stuart Mill's autobiography, my attention was drawn to this sentence: My father told me at that time, when I asked the question 'Who made me?', he did not answer, because immediately without hesitation I had raised the question 'Who made God?'

As I still think, that very simple sentence shows the fallacy in the argument of the first cause. Because if everything must have a cause. If everything comes into existence without cause and reason, just as God's existence is proven, then the said argument becomes invalid. [Why I Am Not a Christian, p14]

Mr. Dawkins writes in the fourth chapter of The God Delusion:

How did the creator himself come into being? [The God Delusion, pp 73&94]

The same question was posed by "Lennox," emeritus professor of mathematics at Oxford University, in his first debate with Dawkins, when Mr. Dawkins asked: Who created the designer (God)? He answered:

I want to trace the question 'Who created God?' because it is a childish question. I am really surprised that the main argument of your book is this!

Because you have assumed that God came into being, so it is not strange to me that you named your book The God Delusion. Because gods that have come into being are inherently delusions. ... To examine this question, we must clarify what we mean by God. If you mean that if God exists, someone must have brought Him into existence, that means you believe in gods that have come into being. But we do not believe in such gods. (All)

Jews, Muslims, and Christians are the same. [Debate between Lennox and Dawkins on The God Delusion, 2007]

□□□

Once, someone challenged me in this way and said: "You, who apparently are a rationalist and believe that everything has a cause, now who is the cause or creator of God?"

In answer to that friend, I said:

Firstly, we do not believe that everything has a cause — every possible essence needs a cause. Because the meaning of "everything" is not clear; what is a thing? Every living being, or every existence, or every essence?

Secondly, when I say God is Necessary Existence, I mean He exists by Himself. And He is not in need of any other existence. Every creature (effect) has a creator (cause), not that every creator (cause of causes) has another creator (another cause). The question of who is the creator of a creator that is not a creature (God) is a childish and contradictory question. It is exactly like me asking: That mountain that was not built by any human, which human built it?!

Well, no one! I myself initially said it was not built by any human! Instead of repeating these fallacies, it is better to ask: How do we know that a Necessary Existence exists? What is the need for such an existence to exist?

Now that's better; this question can be answered. Many philosophers and theologians have proven the Necessary Existence, which, because it requires certain philosophical preliminaries, to avoid prolonging the discussion, let's review the first argument of Auntie's kitchen, which I presented in clip 19, together:

To enjoy a delicious tea at Auntie's house, we must put water in something like a kettle and expose it to high heat, until it boils at 100 degrees Celsius.

Inside this kettle there is water. If we gradually increase the heat of the gas flame from zero to one hundred degrees, the water in this kettle will boil.

Now suppose the temperature had been at 100 degrees Celsius from infinity, well naturally what would happen?

Would the water boil? No; the water would have always been boiling!

Water boils when we raise its temperature to one hundred degrees. That is, we increase its temperature. But when the temperature has always been at 100 degrees Celsius from infinity, any water that exists has already boiled; it will not boil anymore. If we liken the beginning of the universe — based on the Big Bang — to water boiling, if we had boiling water from infinity, then no water would boil anymore — the universe would not begin — if the universe had existed from infinity, either infinite creators or infinite other universes would have been the cause of this universe; the universe would never begin. But the universe has begun — according to a great deal of empirical evidence, the Big Bang happened — so there must necessarily be a Beginner who Himself has not begun (Necessary Existence), and it does not at all end in an infinite regress. [How did an immaterial God cause the material world?, clip 19]

In summary, this argument tells us:

If all the causes of the world have a temporal beginning or are Possible Existence (in need of a cause), meaning that God is also a creature of another creator, the universe would never begin and would not reach its present state. But the universe, based on "physics data," has both begun and several billion years have passed since its beginning, so the universe cannot have an infinite chain of possible existences (infinite causes).

On the other hand, infinite regress is the same as mathematical infinities, and mathematical infinities do not exist at all. And something that does not exist (mathematical infinity) cannot be the cause of something that exists! (the universe!)

Perhaps someone might say your points are correct, and the universe cannot have infinite causes, but everything that exists must be observable and testable. And God — according to theists' definition — is neither observable nor testable. Therefore, such a thing cannot exist.

This argument is not new. It has been around for a long time and has been progressively updated since the 18th century under the headings of Materialism, Physicalism, and Naturalism. Of course, there are fundamental differences between them, and many books have been written to examine their differences and similarities. If we were to fully review and critique them, it would take us far from the goal of this book. So let us pass over this matter with a very simple and brief critique and move on to the next part of the book.

For someone to say that only nature (or physics or matter) exists and nothing else whatsoever can exist, is exactly like assuming that since I was born, I have never left our house, and now, while writing this book, I argue that:

Only our house exists, and nothing else whatsoever — other houses, buildings, villas, or things like our house, such as mosques, factories, and even things that are not of the same kind as our house, like animals and insects — exists!

Richard Dawkins has a beautiful saying:

New physics teaches us that there are more truths than we see; or more than what comes to our minds. [p19]

If the world was not created at some time, it does not mean that it was never created!

Most atheists do not like the idea of the world coming into being at a specific time. And they constantly avoid accepting it with various philosophical and scientific phrases. They repeat the usual clichéd and tedious statements of the standard-bearers of atheism:

- There was no time before the universe, so the universe did not come into being at any time.
- Time exists in this universe, so there is no creator before the universe.
- It is possible that a quantum vacuum brought the universe into existence.

- Because there is a law called gravity, the universe can come into existence from nothing. [Brief Answers To The Big Question, p180]

- According to new physics, there may be countless parallel universes, so a temporal beginning is meaningless.

For our time, we cannot find a single definition. In fact, philosophers, scientists, and religious scholars throughout history have had many conflicts and debates over the existence of time. Whether time is an illusion or an imposition of mental theories on external events, are beliefs that have been stated about time. But all the above arguments are based on the presupposition that time is real, and we accept this presupposition as well.

Look, before I wrote this book, it is very obvious that this book did not exist. But that does not mean that the author of this book did not exist either! In fact, from the moment I started writing this book, this book began, but because this book came into existence at a specific time, it does not mean that its author did not exist before writing! (There must certainly be an author who started — wrote — this book.) If I am within time, then another time passes over me; if I am the creator of time, time will not pass over me.

And in the previous section, we realized that an infinite universe or an infinite creator cannot be the cause of the universe. Now if something like a "quantum vacuum" or the "law of gravity" or anything else had existed from infinity, logically it cannot be the cause of the universe. Unless a Necessary Existence has begun the universe through this means. Regarding parallel universes, Mr. Dawkins directly mentions it in The God Delusion and praises this theory. In the second part, we will examine this theory to which he has given importance.

A number like 2 is even; we cannot conceive of the number 2 as not being even. In theology and philosophy, this is called "Essential Existence." That is, being even is essential to the number 2; we cannot separate 2 from its evenness. If the dependence and essential possibility of the universe also become clear to us, then — due to its essential existence — there must be a Necessary Being that has brought it into existence. By accepting other universes (such as repeating universes or parallel universes), we cannot at all infer the invalidity of God's existence.

If the definition of the universe is that it is established by things like matter and its own physical laws, then this universe and any other possible universe is a Possible Existence and is in need of the "Necessary Existence."

Denial of the evidence does not imply denial of the proven.

A self-evident and elementary philosophical principle is this very point that atheists, including Mr. Dawkins, repeatedly and carelessly and of course unknowingly, act contrary to this principle.

Suppose a person is 40 years old. He was born in a basement and has never left that basement and has never seen the sunlight. Every light he has seen in these forty years has been from a lamp. Now if we make a hole in the ground, so that sunlight shines through this hole into the basement, do you think that person can say to himself: "Well, every light I have seen has been lamplight, so there is nothing other than a lamp — the sun — that exists?"

Certainly not; because if he says this light is from a lamp, that is no proof of the non-existence of the sun. If we say this is sunlight and he refuses, the existence of the sun is not refuted. As the famous saying goes:

"Denial of the evidence does not imply denial of the proven." One of our reasons for the existence of the sun was that light. Now if this reason is not accepted or even refuted, for example, if this light really is from a lamp in a spotlight that we have placed above ground, the existence of the sun is not refuted.

This is an interesting example; even if all the reasons, clues, and evidence do not indicate the existence of the sun, we still cannot judge the non-existence of the sun. Even better, an example I have mentioned in various places: suppose you have no reason for the existence of "Ghazi," this does not mean that you have a reason for the non-existence of Ghazi!

That is, if you have no reason for Ghazi's existence, you cannot say: "So this is proof of Ghazi's non-existence."

Alongside this, if there are disagreements about Ghazi's actions, attributes, and characteristics, Ghazi's existence is not refuted. That is, suppose some say Ghazi is 30 years old. Or Ghazi is 80 years old, or some say Ghazi

is a woman who has changed her voice. Or Ghazi is bespectacled in reality or not, that will not be proof of my non-existence!

If someone tells you that Mr. Ghazi has written a book and, in addition, is the manager of an Instagram page and a YouTube channel, even if you reject these reasons — that he has neither written a book nor has a page or channel — that is no proof of my non-existence. Because "denial of the evidence does not imply denial of the proven."

Suppose all the proofs for the existence of God are also refuted; if your criterion is reason, is this proof of God's non-existence?

This is a very simple and elementary philosophical point that Mr. Dawkins does not know. Dawkins in the third chapter of The God Delusion refutes the theists' reasons for proving God's existence, and then concludes that God does not exist! To prove God's non-existence, one must not only refute all the proofs of God's existence, but must also provide reasons for God's non-existence.

That is why I have said many times that atheists do not have even one valid and convincing reason for the "non-existence of God." If you look fairly at the views of atheist philosophers and rationalists, they never considered themselves complete atheists. Rather, they introduced themselves as agnostics. Among the most famous are "Bertrand Russell" and "Friedrich Nietzsche."

If we compare the example of Ghazi with the existence of God according to the principle that denial of evidence does not imply denial of the proven, it is briefly as follows:

- To prove God's non-existence, one should not refute the proofs of God's existence proposed by theists, because by doing so, one refutes one of the proofs of God's existence, not that God's non-existence is proven!
- If there are disagreements about God's attributes and characteristics, it does not mean God does not exist.
- If all the proofs of God's existence are refuted, it is no proof of God's non-existence.

- Even if all the evidence, documents, and clues do not indicate God's existence, again, it is no proof of God's non-existence.

For the last point, I have a good example in mind. Suppose all the evidence and documents indicate that Navid is the murderer. — Navid is the hypothetical name in our example. — That is, security cameras have captured Navid at the time of the murder and in the vicinity. Several eyewitnesses have seen Navid in the victim's apartment. There is news of signs of animosity and personal hatred between the murderer and the victim. But all this strong evidence and clues does not definitively prove that "Navid is the murderer." Because strong reasons must be given that he is the murderer — if we relate it to the example of God: a reason for the "non-existence of God" must be cited — it must be shown that Navid's hand is in this murder.

If Navid in our story knows himself that he has not committed a murder, but all the evidence is against him, that does not mean he considers himself a murderer. Because all the clues are against him!

Yes; denial of evidence does not imply denial of the proven. If — suppose — all scientific and rational evidence is against the existence of God, the "existence of God" is not refuted. A simple point that accounts for part of Richard Dawkins's errors. In the section "The God rejected by Dawkins," I will name these errors.

Not all theists accept all the proofs for the existence of God.

Theists and religious scholars, depending on the century in which they lived and the information they had from empirical science or philosophy and logic, have accepted some proofs and rejected others. Or they have criticized the proofs of scholars before them or their contemporaries. Some have even mocked certain arguments!

Therefore, if a person rejects one or many of the "proofs of God's existence," he is not an atheist. In the previous section, we discussed this topic together. In the third chapter, Richard Dawkins refutes some — truly — weak proofs of "God's existence" and thinks that all those proofs are accepted by all theists.

Some of the proofs for the existence of God are laughable.

The example of Ghazi's existence has really stuck with me. Let me use the same example once again to drive this point home. Suppose; alongside strong reasons for Ghazi's existence (such as being an author, having a page and channel), someone claims that because Ghazi has a mustache, he exists!

This is a truly laughable reason. Because it proves nothing, and we will also end up in circularity and infinite regress. Having a mustache is not proof of anyone's existence. It can be a reason for recognizing one person from another.

Some people, intentionally or perhaps unknowingly, present arguments for God's existence that are inherently absurd. Not only for atheists, but also for theists, it is apparently considered a good joke.

It is interesting to know that Mr. Dawkins, at the end of page 54 and the beginning of page 55 of The God Delusion, cites a few reasons from a website that is clearly not written by a knowledgeable person — laughable reasons for "proving God's existence"! I too could have presented you with a few reasons from atheist high school students. And said: Here you are, the reasons that make people atheist, these are them! Of course, his main purpose in choosing such an article on that site was to show the weakness of all the arguments for proving God's existence. After reading Mr. Dawkins's copied material, I thought to myself, why did he start from the thirty-sixth argument on that site!

Even I, despite my long experience, had never heard anything so foolish. Until I found many of these so-called wonderful proofs at http://www.godlessgeeks.com/LINKS/GodProof.htm. On this website, we find a list of over three hundred proofs for God's existence, full of comedy. For the sake of amusement, I will bring half a dozen of these proofs here. Let's start with Proof No. 36:

36. Proof of Incomplete Destruction: A plane crashed and 143 passengers and crew were killed. But a child who suffered only thirty percent burns survived the accident. Therefore God exists.

37. Proof of Possible Worlds: If things had been otherwise, then things would have been otherwise. Then it would have been bad. Therefore God exists.

38. Proof of Pure Will: I believe in God! I believe in God! I do; I do; I do. I believe in God! Therefore God exists.

39. Proof of Unbelief: The majority of the world's population does not believe in Christianity. This is exactly what Satan wants. Therefore God exists.

40. Proof of Afterlife Experiences: Person X, an unbeliever, died. Now he realizes his mistake. Therefore God exists.

41. Proof of Emotional Intimidation: God loves you. How can you be so heartless as not to believe in Him? Therefore God exists. [The God Delusion, pp 54 and 55]

Some of the theists' proofs are for strengthening faith, not for proving the existence of God.

Proofs such as the "Argument from Innate Nature (Fitrah)," "Aesthetic," and "Intuition" have been proposed for strengthening and stabilizing the faith of the novice believer. That is, the believer must reach reasons and evidence and form his faith, then later enter into these types of proofs. But unfortunately, atheists like Dawkins first refute these types of proofs and then conclude the "non-existence of God." He has also refuted these proofs in the third chapter of the book, on pages 55 and 56. Proofs that are fundamentally invalid if their earlier premises are not accepted. It is worth mentioning that a few theists reject the proofs for strengthening faith.

A Muslim's faith is not endangered by refuting the proofs of God's existence!

I will show the importance of this section with a memory. Mr. Ahmadi's house is exactly opposite our house, which is two units. I have also accepted this with many rational and heart-based reasons. Reasons such as the title deed, which is in his name, and I have seen that deed several times. Or that he has been our neighbor for several years. Or previously, every time the electricity and gas bill — paper — came to their front door, he would pay it,

and other things of this sort. I also have non-rational reasons, for example, I had heard from him that he could never sleep anywhere but his own house at night, and he always slept in that house.

My memory starts here: one night, after two or three in the morning, my sister and I were watching a horror movie. And my blessed eyes were also falling asleep. The night seemed dark and relatively silent. I remember staring at the television, but with eyes that were leaving the waking scene! Suddenly I heard the sound of the front door of Mr. Ahmadi's house closing. Although I don't consider myself nosy at all, just out of curiosity I jumped up and ran to the window to see if he had gone out? Come in? What had happened?!

Unfortunately, I was late and didn't catch anything. Indifferently I said to my sister — who is also not a nosy person at all: "Mr. Ahmadi must have returned home."

I, like my sister, fell to thinking what on earth Mr. Ahmadi was doing outside at this time of night!

The next night, as it happened, it turned out that Mr. Karimi, Mr. Ahmadi's tenant — who had become our neighbor two or three weeks earlier — far from his wife and children and with fear and anxiety, at that time of night, practiced his noble profession, namely theft, and stole a few simple odds and ends from Mr. Ahmadi's unit...

Until that day, I didn't know Mr. Karimi was a thief. Of course, I heard from the neighbors that the poor guy panicked and, according to his usual habit of fleeing the building after taking something for theft, this time after escaping to the front door and opening it, he realized that his own house was also in the same building.

The important point to note is that some of our usual habits may lead to a blunder — or even worse! — the cause of our arrest.

Yes; anyway, that day my sister, who, like all our neighbors, had heard the story, asked me several times throughout the day: "Didn't you say last night that Mr. Ahmadi returned to his unit? The neighbors say that last night no one was seen returning to his home!"

In these repeated questions, my sister had assumed that my reason for the owner of that house being Mr. Ahmadi was that he had returned home last night. Whereas that was not at all my main and valid reason!

My reason might be completely wrong and based on incorrect assumptions. But my main belief and faith was not such that if someone refuted it with evidence, my belief and faith would be shaken.

I want to say that most followers of the Abrahamic religions — in the case of Muslims, I can say with more certainty — have not acknowledged God because the world must have a cause, or the world is very orderly, or proofs such as ontological ones, so that someone could damage Muslims' beliefs by refuting these reasons. In other words, these proofs are not the obligations and necessities of Muslims' beliefs such that after their refutation, all of Islam would be shaken. Because Muslims' philosophical-theological and scientific proofs are not part of the principles of their religion.

Most religious people's beliefs are not formed on the basis of proof and argument. Rather, they are more based on faith and heart-based reasons. Not in the sense that their beliefs are contrary to sound reason.

How God intervenes in the world

In the past, most followers of non-divine religions, because their level of understanding and reason was relatively lower than today, attributed "natural events" to multiple gods. One god for rainfall, another for volcanic eruptions, a god for sustenance, a god for thunder and wrath, and so on. In recent centuries, thanks to the astonishing advances in empirical sciences, these beliefs in no way have the scientific and rational validity necessary for acceptance, and they have been crushed under the dominion of science.

If I had lived ten centuries ago in such an environment where multiple gods had multiple tasks, perhaps I would have found it difficult to find convincing reasons that this belief is reprehensible and contrary to reason.

But this belief was not the only common belief among followers of non-divine religions; it also affected followers of divine religions. However, followers of Abrahamic religions (Jews, Christians, and Muslims), because they believed in only one God, attributed physical events to multiple

metaphysical matters. This belief too is invalid in its own way. In the section "The God of the gaps," we will examine this issue more precisely.

How God intervenes in the world requires a preface. Its preface is accepting the existence of God. One cannot ask: "How was this book written?" or "In what manner was this book composed?" without accepting the existence of the author of this book. So before a person asks how God intervenes in the world, they must have accepted the existence of God. Because intervening is an "attribute." And one cannot accept an attribute without considering the creator of that attribute.

For example, the color of a shirt is yellow. One of the shirt's attributes is being yellow. I can only comment on "the yellowness of that shirt," question it, or anything else, if I initially accept or assume that this shirt exists.

Many people have expressed their opinions on how God intervenes in the world. Some believe that God only created the world and after that, He did not intervene in it anymore. (His intervention was only at the beginning of the world.) After the beginning of creation, God chose natural relationships, cause and effect, in such a way that they would become self-sufficient. This is the belief of most Deists, who are theists without religion, and the Mu'tazilites in the Islamic world. Another belief, more popular among theists, is that God intervenes every moment in the natural world. For this type of intervention, various methods have been mentioned. Some contemporary Christian thinkers believe that God intervenes in the world through the "quantum world." One of the features of the quantum world is "uncertainty" and the unpredictable behavior of quantum particles. They believe that God uses this method for intervention. Other methods have also been mentioned, which we will examine later.

Richard Dawkins does not know anything about the method of God's intervention in the world. He does not think that before examining how God intervenes in the world, we must have accepted God's existence. Of course, in his book The Blind Watchmaker, he admits that he cannot refute God's intervention in the theistic sense.

There is a clear difference between what is called "instant creation" and what is called "guided evolution." Today's believers, of any creed, have

abandoned the belief in instant creation. Because the evidence for some kind of evolution is undeniable. But many believers who consider themselves evolutionists, including that Bishop of Birmingham whom we quoted in Chapter 2, let the creator in through the back door: they allow him to somehow play the role of supervisor of the evolutionary process throughout history; either through influence at decisive moments in evolutionary history (especially the history of human evolution), or through more pervasive intervention in all the day-to-day events that collectively make up evolutionary changes.

We cannot prove the falsity of these beliefs, especially if it is assumed that the creator is always careful that the result of his intervention looks exactly like what we would expect from natural selection. [The Blind Watchmaker, p221]

Nevertheless; in the fourth chapter of The God Delusion, he claims that if God created life through natural selection, He is a useless God, and he writes sarcastically:

There is no need for God to bother! [The God Delusion, p72]

Of course, I have critiqued this in the first section in the part on evolution by natural selection and in the fourth chapter. A few pages later, he mocks the idea that Swinburne says: "God is simple." Swinburne says:

God enters. To deliberately and continuously maintain the properties of billions of electrons and copper particles, and curb their natural tendency to rebellion and mischief. ... It is God's will that copper particles always behave like copper particles; and it is by God's will that electrons and copper particles always, moment by moment and century by century, behave the same way. Because God's hand is always on every single particle, preventing them from excesses and interfering with each other.

(Dawkins:)

But how does Swinburne consider this hypothesis — that trillions of divine fingers are simultaneously on all unruly electrons — simple? This hypothesis is not at all simple. Swinburne, with astonishing intellectual effrontery, solves the problem in his desired way. He arbitrarily asserts that

God is only a single essence. In comparison to infinite independent electrons that all appear to be one, [The God Delusion, p89]

Of course, I, like Mr. Dawkins, do not agree with that view of "Richard Swinburne." First, pay attention to the debate between Richard Dawkins and John Lennox under the title "Has Science Buried God?" so that we can examine this matter together later. Professor Richard Dawkins says in that debate:

When you drop a stone (from a height), it falls to the ground, and you as a scientist (he means Lennox) explain that event by gravity; it doesn't even cross your mind: surely God brought it down!

(John Lennox:)

No, actually; this is a very important point. Because I have understood from many of your writings that you have assumed God and science as two competing explanations. When Newton discovered the law of gravity, he did not say, "How interesting! Now that I understand how it works, I no longer need God." God is an explanation at the level of agent, not a mechanism.

(Richard Dawkins:)

I suppose that when there is no need for an agent, you remove it from the definition. When you examine what is happening, there may indeed be an agent involved. For example, when you see a car moving and navigating obstacles by moving left and right, you say: an agent is controlling the car. Of course, that is so, and that agent is the driver. But sometimes you do not need an agent to explain a phenomenon, and this is the same in biology and gravity. [Has Science Buried God?, 2017]

The gist of Professor Lennox's statement was that God is an agent, and when examining mechanisms (gravity or evolution), we do not examine the agent. And Professor Dawkins rejected this. And his belief was that there is no need for that agent (God).

Lennox is right. Suppose I have painted a nature scene with various colors and take this painting to an art exhibition. The artists there, as usual, marvel at my art, and the combination of colors and the astonishing scenery

of the painting attracts their attention. And they talk to each other about how and by what method this painting was painted (the mechanism of painting). In this case, the agent or painter of this art is not discussed, and only the how, method, and tools of this art are examined, and it does not at all mean that we think "there is no agent for this painting" or that this mechanism (the painting being painted) was not created by an agent. Rather, it conveys the meaning that in examining the mechanism, we do not consider the agent, and vice versa!

The second case is when the artists or even the non-artists at that exhibition comment on the agent of this painting. And ask themselves: "Why does this painting exist?" or "Why did this painting come to this exhibition?" "Why was this painting painted instead of not being painted?!"

To answer the second case, we ultimately need an agent.

Behind every mechanism that has come into being, there has been an agent. Just because biology or the law of gravity can explain a small part of the world — at the level of mechanism (how) — it is unwise to say that there was no agent. Later, in the section on the relationship between science and religion, and in the last section in the part "Science refutes the existence of God!" we will discuss this issue more.

But to have an understanding of how God intervenes in the world, let us review a few examples from clip 19: How did an immaterial God cause the material world? and clip 20: Science and Religion from Interaction to Conflict, together.

If someone comes and tells me: "Because I know the science of writing a book, I know how this book was written, so this book does not need an author!

Or I know how a house is built (pay attention to the word how), so it had no builder!

I know how animals have spread, so there is no effective God!

I know how a painting is painted, so no painter painted this painting!

I know how Hafez and Rumi's poems were composed, so Hafez and Rumi did not exist!

I know how the phenomena of the world came into being, so they do not need a creator!

[Science and Religion from Interaction to Conflict, clip 20 part 1]

Imagine a builder building a house. While he is placing one brick on another, someone comes to him and says: Because this brick is on top of that brick, its calculations according to gravity are such and such, according to the weak nuclear force such and such, the molecules of the brick react to each other in this way, so not only is there no builder, but the builder also had no role in building this house! We don't take his words seriously!

Science must understand how a phenomenon works, but it cannot understand how the creator intervenes in the phenomenon. Science understands the how at the level of the phenomenon. [How did an immaterial God cause the material world, part 3]

God of the Gaps

God of the gaps, or "God of the gaps," is a god that some theists—followers of divine and non-divine religions—posited as the cause of material phenomena that had not yet been discovered. In the past, this issue was much more prominent.

And, of course, naturally, after a while, when the cause of that phenomenon is discovered by science, this god becomes unemployed and retires and joins history. For example, Newton, the greatest physicist in history, argued that spacetime has existed from eternity, and at some point God poured matter into this spacetime. Later, Einstein, with science, refuted Newton's view.
Or Hegel, the famous German philosopher who lived in the 18th century AD, at a time when a subject called "ether" had been raised in physics and no one yet knew much about it, said: "Ether is God."
Mr. Dawkins has written an interesting point in the book "The Magic of Reality":

The entire history of science has shown us that things we once imagined were the result of supernatural factors—such as gods (whether cheerful and playful gods or angry gods), demons, djinns, spirits, incantations,

and spells—all have had natural explanations, explanations that we can understand, put to the test, and trust. [The Magic of Reality, p. 12]

Yes; that is correct. Whenever we have considered God as the direct creator of matter, we have failed after a while. We have both struck a blow to theology and to empirical sciences, by which we have severely slowed scientific progress. But this is because the system of creation has apparently shown us causal relationships between material phenomena.
I don't remember where I read it, but a saying deeply made me ponder. They say a group boarded a ship, intending to go on a long journey for trade. Near the destination, when no one on the ship had any knowledge of the geography and environment of that ocean, upon seeing a volcano and continuous earthquakes, someone shouted and informed the rest of the ship's inhabitants: "Friends, run away! The god of fire has become angry at our coming here; we must leave immediately!"

On that ship, there was a clever crew member who, immediately after his friend spoke, said: "Is it possible that a god who is the creator of waters and lands would be underwater and prevent us from our business? Surely there is a dragon under the ship that wants to tell us something, but instead of speaking, fire comes out of its mouth, and it is from this fire that it has shaken the world!"

My purpose in recounting this story was that we must give some credit to past generations. They did not have access to or the ability to observe and experiment with these matters behind the scenes. The past must be judged based on the past.
In the fourth chapter of the book "The God Delusion," a section is dedicated to this issue. Dawkins, in a section called The Worship of Gaps, criticizes this issue and writes:

Creationists eagerly seek a gap in our current knowledge or understanding. If they find an apparent gap, they assume that God must necessarily fill it. [The God Delusion, p. 76]

It is undeniable that some creationists have adopted such a practice. But his absolute statement: "Creationists" is not acceptable. Because not all of them are like that. And subsequently—since he has repeated this statement a

lot—I will bring counterexamples. But Mr. Bill Gates, one of the wealthiest people in the world, also agrees with Dawkins. Bill Gates, in response to the question from "Rolling Stone" magazine, which asked "Do you believe in God?" says:

I agree with people like Richard Dawkins that humanity felt the need to construct myths. Before we started understanding disease, weather, and things like that, we were looking for incorrect explanations for them. Now, in some areas (not all areas) that religion was used to fill, science has answered and filled the gaps. But the myth and beauty of the world are astonishingly wonderful, and there is still no scientific explanation for how it reached this point. Saying that the world was built by random irregular numbers, you know, (that view) almost truly seems like an ungenerous view (with laughter). I think belief in God is logical, but exactly what decision you make differently in your life because of this belief, I don't know. [The Rolling Stone Interview, 2016 (cited from Wikipedia)]

Richard Dawkins says once more in the book:
In the minds of creationists, according to their presupposition, God fills the gaps. [The God Delusion, p. 77]

No; not all creationists are like this. We also say:
When the power and action of the Creator of the world are placed alongside the laws of nature, this God will, after a while, sing the farewell song. Atheists say: Before Darwin, God was the cause of man. That is, God was behind the creation of man. But after him, God has fallen behind the Big Bang! Well, they are right. After so many top-tier scientists and philosophers in history have committed these fatal errors, today, Muslims are anew repeating the history of science. That is, instead of saying: "God is the Creator of the laws of biology and physics," they say: "Allah must take the place of a scientific theory like evolution." In other words, they assume the Creator of the laws to be one of the natural laws.
The place of a scientific theory should only be occupied by another theory. God is not the direct cause of material phenomena. God is the Creator of the hows of the universe, and understanding the hows of the universe is possible through science. God is not the direct creator of matter.
Unfortunately, the God of the gaps is considered one of the biggest mistakes of theists in history. And today, it is being updated in various ways, including

intelligent design—which we will examine shortly after. Mr. Dawkins has also constantly exploited this truly awful vacuum, and has made God merely an explanation for unknown phenomena.

Atheism of the Gaps

This part, I think, is one of the most interesting parts of this book. Initially, I wanted to raise this part with such content and subject in another book. But the enthusiasm and excitement in the final draft of this book did not leave me alone, and I want to write it down sooner than previously planned.

The matter is that for atheism, there are very large gaps. Gaps that have arisen from superficiality and ignorance regarding some empirical sciences. In the section on God of the gaps, we examined that there were specific theistic narratives in the past that directly connected "still undiscovered natural events" to the divine hand and agency, exploiting scientific ignorance to stamp approval on their own beliefs.
In the atheism of the gaps, atheists like Dawkins no longer exploit undiscovered natural events; they use "discovered natural events" to make belief in God appear unreasonable.

When we have very little information about the biological and physical issues of the world around us, the atheism of the gaps suggests that everything has been discovered right now, and naturally, it will present us with two similar approaches. I will mention those two approaches later. We continue the story from chapter eleven of the book "The Magic of Reality": Many people believe that their God intended to create a flawless world, but, unfortunately, something went wrong somewhere and it didn't happen. There is much disagreement about where exactly things went wrong. According to the Dogon tribe of West Africa, at the beginning of the world, there was a cosmic egg from which twins emerged. If the two had emerged from the egg at the same time, everything would have been fine, but unfortunately, one of the twins emerged earlier, and God's plan for establishing perfection was spoiled. The reason for the occurrence of bad events, according to the Dogon tribe, is this. [The Magic of Reality, p. 116]

If we pass over why Dawkins, among all these multi-billion-follower religions, chose a tribe in Africa to express disagreement, and also pass over

why he chose a tribe in the West—and not in the North or South of Africa!—but this very phrase "something went wrong somewhere" and that the world is not lacking in flaws and imperfections, reveals the atheism of the gaps. Those two approaches were: one, that science has been able to explain everything. Two, that this science, which we have made the only means of explaining the universe, has shown us that there are countless defects, gaps, and holes in the universe.

Now, this conflicts with a God who is wise and does not do futile work. Because the report of powerful scientific tools and the world we observe is such, therefore, a God who is knowing and wise does not exist. Let me explain these weighty and freshly-baked statements! with a discovered scientific example. In our bodies, there are various types of large biological molecules. One of these molecules is "nucleic acid." Nucleic acid is divided into two types, one of which is deoxyribonucleic acid, abbreviated as "DNA." The other is ribonucleic acid, or "RNA."

"DNA" is, in fact, the genetic material of humans, studied in genetics and genetic inheritance. After extensive examination and study of the genome, scientists have found that only about one percent of the content of "DNA" is coding, and most DNA is useless and lacks value, dubbed "junk DNA." "Coding" is a process during which another type of biological molecule, which incidentally constitutes the most abundant type of biological molecules, namely "proteins," is made. Proteins are of great importance within cells. Proteins help the vital functions of the cell in various ways, such as being secretory, regulatory, enzymatic, etc.
"Junk DNA" is a region of the DNA sequence that does not code and therefore apparently—as its name suggests—has no use or benefit and is considered garbage regions in DNA.

And now, Richard Dawkins, in his own way, wants to question a creator who is omniscient, meaning knows everything, and also omnipotent, meaning capable of doing anything. Three years after writing "The God Delusion," he wrote a book called "The Greatest Show on Earth." I quote from the site evolutionnews:

He {Dawkins} presents the junk status of most of the genome as an established scientific fact (in his book). (According to him, this issue is) useful for us but embarrassing for creationists.

Dawkins writes in The Greatest Show on Earth:
They {theists} even use their creative ingenuity to come up with a plausible reason why an intelligent designer would create junk DNA—a gene that does absolutely nothing and is apparently a copy of a gene that once did something—unless he deliberately set it up to fool us. [The Greatest Show on Earth, pp. 332 & 333 (cited from evolutionnews)]

After a while, when geneticists became familiar with the function of this part of "DNA," which has a populist name, and understood that this part is involved in regulating gene expression and indirectly in some cellular activities, and these findings and information gradually reached the scientific community and science enthusiasts, Mr. Dawkins no longer holds his previous position. That is, he can no longer exploit this "discovered natural event" for the atheism of the gaps!

Today, as our studies on cells and especially DNA have increased, we have found that:

Some of those regions {junk DNA} have been conserved during evolution and may play a key role in the regulation of spatial and temporal gene expression. [Principles of Medical Genetics and Genomics, p. 22]

If we examine this issue a bit more scientifically:

A large amount of junk DNA in the mammalian genome consists of sequences derived from transposable elements. The occurrence of mutations and the like can give rise to various new functional sequences, such as regulatory sequences, new exons, lncRNAs, and sometimes even genes. [HUMAN MOLECULAR GENETICS, p. 427]

Three years after writing "The Greatest Show on Earth," when Dawkins debated with "Jonathan Sacks," his compatriot rabbi, held on the "BBC" network, he changed his view. He said:
We used to think that a portion of DNA is functional (i.e., only a part of DNA) performs the protein-coding function. But today we have found that a large

amount of DNA is involved in coding. Its function is to activate protein-coding genes. So you can think of protein-coding genes as a toolbox for programs that are common to almost all mammals. Mice and humans, generally, share protein-coding genes that have always been the same. This is a blow to human self-esteem. [Sacks and Dawkins at BBC RE, 2012]

Since the issue of "junk DNA" was raised a few decades ago, it was only Mr. Dawkins who exploited this "discovered natural event" for the inefficacy of belief in God. Just like some previous non-monotheistic theists who filled scientific gaps with God, this time he alone filled a scientific gap and vacuum with atheism. A gap that only lasted for him for three years. And his beliefs and arguments collapsed with the unexpected progress of computer science and the integration of physics with biology, and new genetic techniques.

Dawkins' Rejected God

The God that Dawkins rejects is a God with a popular and anthropomorphic conception. God is defined in "The God Delusion" as follows:

God not only created the world but is also a personal God who resides within the world, or perhaps outside it (outside in whatever sense may be intended). [The God Delusion, p. 30]

The anthropomorphic God is a subset of the personal God, whose attributes and characteristics are exactly similar to human behavior and actions. In the section on Personal God and Impersonal God, we thoroughly examined the difference between these "two conceptions of God." Some of those who have the conception of a personal God in mind accept the anthropomorphic God, and others do not. But how do we know that Mr. Dawkins' intended God is the anthropomorphic God?

From the friendly discussion that Mr. Dawkins had with "Brian Greene." In a part of this conversation, where the discussion about how God intervenes in the world became heated, and the concept of God and the deistic God were raised, Dawkins' belief was that if we believe God created the world, our scientific investment is wasted. Brian Greene, who is a theoretical physicist, and his specialty is examining the various things of the cosmos over

its 13.7 billion-year lifespan, said in response to Dawkins: The further back we can go, the happier I am. Let me explain with an example. If I can explain from a billion-billion-billionth of a second after the Big Bang until today, and if I can also understand that other piece without needing a creator, I will be pleased. But it's not like that if we say: God created the world, all our (scientific) investment is wasted. So I want to say... (Richard Dawkins immediately said:)

It might be because we biologists (and not physicists) need to explain: where did the brain capable of designing something come from? (Brian Greene:)

But you don't need to go back as far as I do (in time). (Richard Dawkins:)

Right.
(Brian Greene:)

Apparently, you are placing your own temporal wall much further ahead of mine (and the field of biology). So if I am satisfied, God knows, maybe you will be satisfied too!

(Richard Dawkins:)

That's not right at all. That's not right at all. [Richard Dawkins and Brian Greene, 2018]

Although, in the end, Professor Brian Greene added a humorous touch to the conversation, however, the anthropomorphism of Dawkins' rejected God was understandable from this. He thought that only the human brain has the ability to design something, and if it is claimed that "the world is designed," it means that biologists—in the evolutionary narrative—must comment on God.

In this conversation, other incorrect assumptions are also embedded. One of those incorrect assumptions that Brian Greene mistakenly believed was that in examining the fraction of a second at the beginning of the universe, or the "Planck time," he preferred that God not be there to solve that mystery! In

the section on God of the Gaps and God is Not the Direct Creator of Matter, we will examine these incorrect assumptions.

Another mistake came from Dawkins. For a precise and scientific examination of the brain and mind, it is not only biology that steps forward. Various other sciences such as physics, mathematics, chemistry, or even humanities like philosophy, psychology, etc., all consider themselves candidates for research and study on the subject. Something like the brain is so complex, difficult, and opaque that today it is viewed as an interdisciplinary subject.

Let's not stray from this topic. In short, if I say: Because humans can design something like a puzzle, and the human brain—assuming only—is examined by biology, Dawkins, who has considered an anthropomorphic God, assumes that God's existence must also be determined and examined by biology!

That is, he thinks that the existence of God is a life within the framework of biology and merely physicalism, which must have been traversed through evolution. -At the beginning of the second part, the second chapter, we will critique this view in detail.- Physicalism is the philosophical theory that says everything that exists is composed of physical objects and properties. "Everything is physical." There is nothing other than physics. His theological delusions are not only seen in this book. In his other books and numerous other debates, similar arguments can be found. In his latest debate with "Francis Collins," he says:

Richard Swinburne the theologian says: It's very easy, God is completely simple, you don't need a complex God.
I {Dawkins} think this is ridiculous. Because if he were simple, he couldn't have invented the fundamental constants of physics. [Biology, Belief and Covid, 2022]

If we proceed with this same logic, then the evolution of mammals, which are considered advanced organisms, from single-celled and simpler organisms is impossible. Because simple cannot create complex. Whereas Mr. Dawkins firmly and heartily believes in this evolution.

Moreover, the terms simple and complex are not applicable to a metaphysical existence at all. We cannot extend complexity, which is a characteristic of material and physical beings, to metaphysics. If we overlook this point, a person like Mr. Dawkins, who believes in nothing other than matter, would not consider the existence of a non-material thing to require complexity! -In the section on the Mentality, Thoughts, and Beliefs of Richard Dawkins, we have thoroughly examined this issue.- The next point is that to attribute a characteristic to an existence, we must have at least a minimal knowledge of it. God is neither simple nor complex. Insofar as God is not at all complex, we say God is simple. We will follow this up later. The God that Dawkins rejects is the same God that I also reject. However, the difference is that he has become more atheistic from this, and I have become more monotheistic.

In the section Which God? we will say that many of the strange and weird words by which God is called do not possess the attributes of a transcendent being. The God that Dawkins wants to reject does not need 400 pages (English edition) of argument; it doesn't need writing at all; this God is utterly rejected in itself.

Although Mr. Dawkins has not presented any argument for the non-existence of God in these several hundred pages, the arguments he thinks reject God's existence—read once more the section The negation of the proof does not imply the negation of the proven—are "refutations of the proofs for the existence of God" commonly put forward by theists.

He has presented two arguments in the third chapter of The God Delusion to refute the existence of God (refuting the reasons for God's existence!):

1. The Ontological Argument
2. The Argument from Design

Two important points regarding these two arguments—and other proofs for God's existence—that should be kept in mind are that many of these arguments need updating, and refuting their updated versions is truly not an easy task. The second point is that for all arguments, there are weaker and stronger versions. And for a scholarly work, the strongest available version should be

examined.
But Dawkins' skill in refuting these arguments is that he has compiled versions from Anselm or Aquinas, two priests who lived more than 11 centuries ago, and chosen the weakest possible narrative, then attempted to refute it. He considers the other proofs he has presented for refuting (the reasons for!) God's existence to be without value. And indeed, he is right. Perhaps not because he is truth-seeking, but because he has overlooked the two points mentioned. Richard Dawkins, by presenting old versions and the weakest narratives of the proofs for God's existence, attempts to discredit them. For other refutations of (the reasons for!) God's existence in the third chapter of The God Delusion, he has preferred these statements over sound reasoning:

- ❖ Aquinas's five proofs establish nothing. [p. 50]
- ❖ These proofs are one (especially in Aquinas's proofs).
- ❖ It's not even a proof. [p. 51]
- ❖ The argument is infantile. [p. 52]
- ❖ Has no philosophical or scientific value whatsoever.
- ❖ Cannot prove God's existence.

Which God?

Mr. Dawkins, after the highly successful "The God Delusion," wrote another book in 2019 for beginner atheists, titled "Outgrowing God." In the first chapter of that book, he raises the question: Which God? Throughout history, thousands of gods have been worshipped all over the world.

Odin (the supreme god of the Vikings) or other Viking gods including Balder (god of beauty), Thor (god of thunder with his mighty hammer), and moreover, goddesses such as Snotra (goddess of wisdom), Frigg (goddess of motherhood), and others were also present in this spectrum. The ancient Greeks and Romans were also polytheists. Their gods, like the Viking gods, were very anthropomorphic and full of deep human passions and emotions. The twelve male and female Greek gods were often associated with their Roman counterparts, who were thought to be engaged in the same occupations, gods such as Zeus, king of the gods, with his thunderbolts; Hera his wife; Poseidon god of the sea; Aphrodite goddess of love; Hermes the messenger of the gods who flew with winged sandals; Dionysus god of wine.

Among the religions that have survived to this day, Hinduism is also a polytheistic religion with thousands of gods.
Why does no one believe in Zeus anymore? One can't be sure, but the vast majority of us are confident enough to say we are 'atheistic' towards those ancient gods.

I, like you, do not expect myself to believe in Jupiter or Poseidon or Thor or Venus or Cupid or Snotra or Mars or Odin or Apollo. I do not believe in the gods of ancient Egypt like Osiris, Thoth, Nut, Anubis, or his brother Horus, who, like Christ and many other gods around the world, is said to have been born of a virgin. I do not believe in Hadad, Enlil, or Anu, or Dagon, or Marduk, or other ancient Babylonian gods either.

I do not believe in Anyanwu, Mawu, Ngai, or any of the African sun gods. Likewise, I do not believe in Bila, Ganawuri, Wala, Wuriupranili, or Karawaru, or Hichik, the goddesses of Australian Aboriginal tribes. I also do not believe in the numerous male and female Celtic gods, such as Aedh, or the Irish goddess of the sun, or Elatha, the moon god. I do not believe in Mazu, the Chinese goddess of water, or Dakuwaka, the Fijian shark god, or Iluyanka, the ocean dragon of the Hittites.

I do not believe in any of the hundreds and hundreds of gods of the sky, river, sea, sun, star, moon, weather, fire, forest... so many gods not to believe in!
And, of course, I do not believe in Yahweh, the god of the Jews. [Outgrowing God, pp. 16-18]

I should say, is that all? Very useful!
In short, Mr. Dawkins, in those truly tedious pages, wanted to tell us that as an atheist, he has denied only one more god than we have, and we are all atheists regarding a very large number of gods:
When I am asked whether I am an atheist, an interesting tactic is to point out to the questioner that he himself is an atheist regarding Zeus, Apollo, Ammon, Ra, Mithras, Baal, Thor, Wotan (Odin), the Golden Calf, and the Flying Spaghetti Monster. I just go one god further. [The God Delusion, p. 38]

He repeated this in a different way in an interview with CNN. Richard Dawkins asked himself in that interview:

What happens when I die?

Assuming the impossible, if I see God after my death, I will ask him: "Which god are you?" Are you Zeus? Are you Thor? Baal, Mithras, Yahweh? Which god are you, and were you sick that you hid yourself from us and became distant from us? [CNN, 2012]

Apart from this "theological delusion" of his, where he imagines "God has hidden himself from us!" because even no theist has such an expectation, and we examined this in the section on Dawkins' Rejected God, but his precise point in these two books and this interview is that the difference between atheists and followers of Abrahamic religions is that we are atheists or infidels to 3000 gods, and followers of Abrahamic religions are infidels to 2999. In response to this argument, it must be said that just because someone stands up and says such-and-such is God, we do not say, "Oh, how interesting! A new god has been added to the existing gods, and the number of gods has increased," no.

God in monotheistic theology is not like buying apples, where I go to the fruit shop in the city center and buy all the apples in three large boxes, leaving only one apple in the shop. The shopkeeper, in a hurry on his way out, tells me: "Mr. Ghazi, take this apple left in the shop with you." And I reply, "Alright, you put this apple in the middle box!"

We do not have large boxes full of gods for another god to join them. This argument that there are 3000 gods, atheists are infidels to all of them, and theists are infidels to 2999, is exactly like me saying that, assuming there are 3000 jobs in the world, and Mr. Dawkins is a biologist, and I am unemployed. I, the unemployed one, who has no job and fundamentally does not want to have a job and believes in no job, tell Mr. Dawkins: "The difference between you and me is that I am a non-believer in 3000 jobs, and you are a non-believer in 2999!"

The fact that I believe in Allah does not mean that there are 2999 other gods that I do not believe in. No! Because 3000 Necessary Existences—which we thoroughly examined in the section Who created God?—fundamentally cannot exist. The fact that the worldview of some theists regarding God's relationship with the world and the type of his intervention in the world is

ridiculous and childish, and they have non-monotheistic beliefs, that is their mistake. For seven reasons:

First, the God of Abrahamic religions is one. (Although, it should be noted that they differ on some attributes.)

Second, we do not consider God the direct creator of matter. -We will examine this more later.-

Third, matter (because it is limited in all aspects) cannot be God. Fourth, the God of deism—non-religious theists—has the attributes of the same God we speak of. (The names may not be the same.) Fifth, multiplicity of names does not imply multiplicity of existences. For example, if one says Allah, another says Khoda, and another says Gad, it does not mean there are three distinct existences—if you recall, in the section on the Concept of God, we understood the definition of existence! Sixth, we define God; if the definitions are the same (regardless of the name), then we are talking about one specific existence. For example, my real and official name is not Ghazi, and this book is written under the name Ghazi. Now if someone—pretending to be a scholar!—comes and argues that because there are two names (Ghazi and my real name), this book belongs only to one of them, it is not acceptable!

And finally, seventh, any being that is not Necessary Existence and does not possess divine attributes and characteristics, we do not consider it God at all so that we should disbelieve in it! Whether it is Zeus, king of the gods, or Poseidon, god of the sea; Aphrodite, goddess of love; Hermes, the messenger of the gods who flew; Dionysus, god of wine; Anyanwu, Mawu, Ngai, or any of the African sun gods; or Elatha, the moon god. A god that has only one specific function in the universe, like the god of the sea, or love, or wine, or the god of the sun and moon, these do not possess the attributes of a Necessary Existence that is Omnipotent. Because the Omnipotent manages all of creation, not just one specific part, like the sea and the moon!

And finally, this quote from Mr. Dawkins, who says: "So many gods not to believe in!"

Dear friend, we do not consider these as gods to not believe in. Anything other than the specific God of water, earth, wind, and so on, which is limited like a cow or a mouse or a genital organ, does not even require investigation to see if it is God! At least, perhaps, it is like this for us. But it is interesting that if Mr. Dawkins were in an environment where there were cow-worshippers, idol-worshippers, phallus-worshippers, and generally those who worship beings within this world, and people who have considered multiple gods for natural events, he would accept all these beings that these friends introduce as god or gods—he says there are 3000 gods—but when facing a monotheistic theist philosopher, he says there is no god at all! If different names were proof that we necessarily have various existences and things, then water, "al-ma'" (water in Arabic), and "water" (water in English) and the names for water in 97 other languages (which are not similar) would prove that we have 100 different substances!

Personal God and Impersonal God

Theologians, regarding belief in God, in one division, form two groups. By theologians, I mean followers of Abrahamic religions who engage in discussion, dialogue, argumentation, and sometimes new interpretations about God. Generally, they speak about "God's attributes and actions." Well; I was talking about those two groups. Some of them believe that the "concept of God" is not conceivable at all, and we can only recognize the signs of God. The second group believes that the concept of God must be clear to us so that we can worship Him, and true knowledge of God is necessary for a rational and error-free worship.

But in the midst of these arguments, theologians have two separate conceptions of God:

1. Personal God (also called personal or anthropomorphic.)

2. Impersonal God (also known as the God of pantheism, philosophical, or Spinozan.)

Of course, these are our conceptions of God, not that there are two different Gods! I can explain better with a memory. During my school days, I clearly remember that we had a class called "Art

Class." Early on, our teacher told us: In this class, we will become familiar with various arts in a preliminary way, from painting, drawing, crafts, etc. Our art teacher was actually our school's vice-principal for training, but because there were few art teachers in the city, he became our teacher and taught art. He didn't know much about the "field of art" in a specialized way, but he was truly a creative teacher.

One day, he came to class with a large "pitcher" and placed it firmly. He immediately went and dragged his desk, which was in the corner of the class, onto the floor and placed it right in front of the whiteboard. -I can still hear the screeching sound of that desk when the teacher dragged it.- He put the pitcher on the desk and said: You have half an hour for everyone to draw this pitcher on the desk, with all its highlights and shadows, from your own seats.

I was taking my paper and drawing pencil out of my bag when our teacher continued: "That is, each person, depending on where they are sitting, the position, angle, and light that creates a specific shadow for the pitcher from there, must draw a unique design."

It seemed like a good idea. The student sitting directly in front of the pitcher had to draw and sketch the highlights and shadows of the pitcher as he saw it. Another student in the far corner of the class had to do the work in a different way. And so on.

After half an hour, or maybe more, we gave our drawings to the teacher. Someone unaware of this story from our class, seeing these drawings, would think that "thirty pitchers" had been brought for our thirty-student class. Whereas it was our perceptions, approaches, positions, ways of looking, and angles of view that had produced different drawings. "And not, thirty different pitchers!"

The topic of Personal God and Impersonal God is like drawing the pitcher in our art class. That is, the understanding and perception we have of God falls into one of these two categories. But let's examine: "Are all perceptions of God correct?" "Can any perception be valid?"

For now, let's become familiar with the definition and concept of these two perceptions, and then we will also reach the answers to the questions.

Personal God is a God who is considered separate from creation and, in fact, "one existence, outside of other beings." In other words, a person, often with human attributes and characteristics, who is separate from the world. The "Stanford Encyclopedia" defines it as:

A God with whom one can communicate as a person. [Stanford Encyclopedia]

For example, when we say the creator of a mobile phone, a person or human or human-like robot, separate from the mobile phone, comes to mind. The creator of the universe, in the context of the Personal God, is similar to this. This God is the God of the majority of followers of Abrahamic religions and among them has fervent supporters.

From a rational and religious point of view, this conception of God has many problems and raises many doubts for us. One of the main problems that atheists have with theists in "theological discussions" is precisely this issue. But, well; we shouldn't expect high-level thinking from the majority. – As you will understand in the section Popular Conception – when the relationship between oneself and God is raised in "intellectual and faith-related matters," not all people are at the same level and status.

It doesn't seem surprising that not all religious people have the same level of knowledge. It's not only in this matter that this is the case. It is obvious that not all biologists and biology students have a correct understanding of biological topics and theories. Or any physics student cannot understand "General Relativity" or "Quantum Mechanics" as needed. -Of course, not only physics students, but even physics scientists have not understood it precisely!- No religious person or religious scholar has known God as He deserves. But for their own relationship with their God, they imagine some attributes and characteristics to simplify the matter. People have also tried to simplify general relativity or quantum mechanics. Giving these attributes and characteristics to God, if done excessively, is undesirable. That is, the same anthropomorphic God, whose functions and actions are exactly like those of a human.

Impersonal or pantheistic God is a God who is not considered separate from creation, and because He is the most perfect existence, His existence is everywhere. This God is the God of philosophers, mystics, most thinkers,

divine sages, and some theists (not just religious people). As "Stace" says in his famous book:

In philosophy and theology, this is the theory that God is the whole and the whole is God. The created world is not distinct from God. God is the world and the world is God. [Philosophy and Mysticism, p. 214]

Understanding the conception of the Impersonal God is not easy and requires years of exploration in intellectual sciences. But today, as people's level of reasoning has increased more than in the past, it can be understood more easily. Just close your eyes and imagine a garden with two or three trees and a meadow.

Well, close your eyes for a moment, and after you have done that, come and read the rest with me.

Most people, as I mentioned a little above, cannot accept this conception of God. That is, they think that when we say: "The universe is the realm of God's existence," it means that the universe is God. They think "pantheism" means that the world and nature are God!

With the same tree and meadow you imagined, the incorrectness of this argument becomes clear. When you had your eyes closed, you existed. And when you imagined a garden with a few trees and a meadow, they also came into existence. Now, can I say: when you had your eyes closed, you became a garden with two or three meadows?

No; because the existence of that garden has come into being relative to its non-existence, not relative to you! Your existence is so powerful—because you have objective existence—that that imagination—which had a mental existence—can never replace you or equal your existence. But that garden and your existence were one existence, not several! Attar of Nishapur says:

The share of creation from Him is nothing but fantasy
Giving news of Him is nothing but impossibility
If they have spoken of good and evil to the extreme
Whatever they said of Him, they said of themselves

[The Conference of the Birds, The tale of the thief who did not kill the one who had eaten his bread and salt]

The conception of the pantheistic God, which later became more systematized by "Spinoza" and became more famous as Spinoza's God, means that only "one existence" can be, which is that Absolute Existence—God—and His creatures are so low in the degrees of existence (possible existences) that they cannot be said to be present alongside this existence at all. Rather, they exist relative to their own non-existence and relative to each other (you and me relative to each other). Of course, this does not mean that we are in the imagination of God—nothing is like God—for this reason, a moment ago I asked you to imagine that garden in your mind, so that you would know that every creator is not necessarily separate from his creation. And in fact, this was an example to understand: what is the nature of God's relationship with His creatures, and to become more familiar with God's method of creation. Not that God and creation are exactly like your state and the garden—when you had your eyes closed!

As Rumi says, our limited existence is not comparable to the absolute existence of God at all. To put it better, relative to that Essence, we do not exist at all:

Who are we, O You who are the life of our lives? That we should exist as an intermediary with You?

We are non-existences, and our existences

You are Absolute Existence, appear as mortal [Mathnawi, Book One, p. 35]

Apart from rational reasons, there are also verses in the Quran that cannot be accepted with the first conception of God—the Personal God—and raise doubts that cannot be easily resolved. For example, the verse "He is the First and the Last and the Outward and the Inward." or the verse after it, "He is with you wherever you are," cannot be understood with a God who is separate from creation. Or there is a verse in Surah An-Nur that says: "God is the Light of the heavens and the earth." Understanding this verse is very difficult, and its interpretation according to a Personal God is incomprehensible. When God and the world are introduced as Creator and

creature, with a little thought, many examples of this kind can be observed around us. But the Creator being light is almost vague and unparalleled. And it is only understandable with one Existence, who has brought His creatures into the arena of existence and through "existence" they have unity together. I said that understanding this conception is a bit difficult. Correctly understanding the "Impersonal God" is like when the greatest mathematician in history presents the concept of "n-dimensionality" of a geometric body to university professors and mathematicians. For these mathematicians, understanding "n-dimensionality" of a body is difficult. Let alone students of various branches of mathematics, or even simple high school teenagers. A child or teenager can understand simple principles of mathematics. But not every problem can be solved by a student, perhaps not even a mathematician. In religion and the definition of God, it is the same. Divine sages and philosophers (not all of them!) have a better understanding of God than those who have not delved deep into these matters, and they reject the "Personal God." But just as not everyone is expected to be able to handle a problem of "integration" or "general relativity," not every religious person can be expected to understand the type of God-world relationship or his important and sensitive religious matters. They simply haven't thought about it enough to offer their views and solutions!

Well; so far, based on rational and transmitted reasons, we have examined that the "Personal God" brings many problems with it—what does this have to do with this book?—Its relevance is that Mr. Dawkins throughout the book "The God Delusion" attempts to refute the "Personal God." Richard Dawkins fundamentally denies the Impersonal God. Not that he provides a reason for refuting it, no!

Because it is clear that his knowledge of theology comes from the common people of his city. One of his most unexpected statements in this book is that in the first chapter of The God Delusion, he accused "Albert Einstein," the most famous physicist of the 20th century, who said: I cannot imagine a Personal God—and believed in Spinoza's God—of being an atheist. Dawkins said in that chapter: "Einstein's concept of God is not God at all." [The God Delusion, p. 19]

He quotes Einstein as saying:

In my view, the idea of a personal God is quite alien to me and even seems naive. [The God Delusion, p. 17]

Dawkins concludes from this statement that Einstein is an atheist. Let's examine this issue completely and in detail in that same chapter.

Mr. Dawkins, in the second chapter, under the discussion of monotheism, defines God as follows:

God not only created the world, but is also a personal God who resides within the world, or perhaps outside it (outside in whatever sense may be intended). [The God Delusion, p. 30]

The first part of the definition is correct, but the second part is inaccurate. Whose theologian's definition is this exactly? One of the fundamental flaws of Mr. Dawkins is that for these important matters, he substitutes "made-up" definitions for acceptable ones. Also, what does "outside in whatever sense may be intended" mean? He should have explained this fully. This statement does not follow the scientific manner—which requires clarity of meaning—at all.

In the third chapter, in the section on the Arguments of Prominent Religious Scientists, we will say that atheism among the elite of society from the mid-20th century to its end spread widely. But gradually, the return to theism from the end of the 20th century began to move like a small wave on distant horizons. The statistics Dawkins gives about scientists' atheism relate to the period when atheism was at its peak. You will probably be surprised—like me—that he bestows the title of atheist on scientists who do not believe in a "Personal God"—like Albert Einstein:

A study by Larson and Witham, published in the prestigious journal Nature in 1998, shows that among scientists considered sufficiently eminent by their peers to be members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, only seven percent believe in a personal God. This very clear tendency of prominent scientists towards atheism is almost the exact opposite of the religiosity statistics in the general American population, where over 90 percent believe in some form of supernatural being. [The God Delusion, p. 63]

Theists have two different conceptions of God. Personal God and Impersonal God. If someone rejects the Personal God, they are not an atheist! It's very simple.

God is not the direct creator of matter.

Among Islamic thinkers, there is the concept that "this world is not the only creation that God has created." And there are other creations besides this world, such as the Throne, the Pedestal, and other worlds. Among these, some creations were created earlier and some later. Theologians have spoken about the first creation that God created. Light, the Preserved Tablet, the Reality of Muhammad, the First Intellect, and the Pen; these are considered the first divine creation.

Our world, which is physical and material, is not classified among the first creations. Therefore, the world was not created directly and without mediation. Rather, it came into being from creations that existed before. God is not the direct creator of matter and physics. Insofar as God is Existence, we say He is the direct creator of every type of existence—whether material or immaterial. God has a direct relationship with creation through existence. Matter has no connection whatsoever with the "attributes of God" like creatorship. In the section on God of the gaps, we also understood that those who believed in the God or gods of the gaps generally had this mentality.

The proofs for God's existence are different from the proofs for God's attributes.
It is quite obvious that someone who, for example, brings reasons for my existence, those reasons are not exactly the same as the proofs for some of my attributes and characteristics.

Reasons for Ghazi's existence:

✓ He is active on Instagram.

✓ He has a YouTube channel.

✓ He has produced many clips and posts.

✓ I have a book he wrote.

Now, Ghazi's attributes could be:

✓ His favorite color is "gray."

✓ He has a beard and mustache.

✓ He is a writer.

If someone rejects one of my attributes, do you think "my existence" is also rejected?

Certainly not; God's existence and attributes are exactly the same. Atheists, for example, by raising the problem of evil, reject one of God's attributes, such as His benevolence or omnipotence, and then conclude that they have proven the non-existence of God!

Or, to speak more precisely, Mr. Dawkins, in the discussion of God being the First Cause—which he insists He is not!—at the beginning of the third chapter and under Aquinas's proofs, says: If God is the terminus of the series or the First Cause, we have absolutely no reason to consider that being to possess the attributes attributed to God. Attributes such as omnipotent, omniscient, and...

Even if we ease our minds and assume the existence of a terminus for the infinite regress, we have absolutely no reason to consider that being to possess the attributes usually attributed to God: attributes such as being omnipotent, being omniscient, goodness, creatorship, let alone human-like qualities such as answering prayers, forgiving sins, and knowing what is in the hearts. [The God Delusion, p. 50]

This truly proves Dawkins' "theological delusion." Because he thinks that if God is proven as the cause of the world, all the attributes, qualities, and related issues regarding God must also be proven immediately—without any delay and without presenting another argument! We will examine the incorrectness of this argument in the same chapter—a little further ahead. If you have read The God Delusion, it is not at all surprising to you that he has made many theological errors. Mr. Dawkins writes about the field of theology: For my part, I see no good reason to consider theology (as opposed to biblical history, literature, etc.) as a subject of study. [The God Delusion, p. 39]

When you have no information about the basics of theology and don't even accept it as a discipline, then why have you written a book whose major content is about theology?

Right now, I remembered that saying of "Terry Eagleton" at the London Book Festival. When The God Delusion was recognized as one of London's best books, Terry Eagleton, one of Europe's most prominent critics, stated:

Dawkins's views on theology resemble the views of someone talking about biology whose knowledge on the subject is limited to the book "British Birds." [Terry Eagleton reviews, 2006]

But interestingly, Richard Dawkins, in his debate with Francis Collins just a few months ago, no longer accepts this view that "all attributes and characteristics of God must be proven exactly at the same time we accept God":

You might convince someone like me, due to the fine-tuning argument, to be a deist. (But) later we suddenly say we believe in Jesus Christ, and then he was crucified, then we accept the resurrection, then we accept the virgin birth of Jesus, these have nothing to do with that. My point is that this is a package which is probably a dishonest way of stuffing in what they (some religious people) actually want. ... But don't think that because you convinced someone with the fine-tuning argument that a God exists, he must therefore believe in Jesus too. [Biology, Belief and Covid, 2022]

His new statement is completely correct. Because the proofs for God's existence are different from the proofs for God's attributes. This short statement from the debate was relevant to this section; we will critique his full statement in that debate in later sections.

Popular Conception

The sayings and deeds of a beginner theist—exactly like an atheist—are not a criterion or valid evidence for evaluating the beliefs and values of that doctrine or school.

The term "popular" in religion—as it first creates an impression in the mind—is not a very bad thing. All of us, regarding many subjects, are literally "laypeople," and for the same reason that we do not expect a high school student to have a correct understanding of mathematical topics or biology content, we should not expect a beginner religious believer to understand the rulings and principles of his religion perfectly.

What will be considered valid for the people of knowledge—not for the people of disputation or sophistry—is what is expressed and explained by the scholars of that school, not its laypeople!

Knowing limited aspects of many subjects will lead to incorrect and undesirable understanding for us. To avoid this, we have no more than two solutions:

✓ We should not think in a limited and biased manner.

✓ We should learn from the knowledgeable people of that subject.

And the exact opposite is also true. That is, the value of a thought is measured by its scholars.

One can cite examples that have followers among the laity but are not acceptable to the scientific community. Various forms of fortune-telling, such as coffee cup reading, and subjects related to pseudoscience, like the "Law of Attraction," are cases in point.

The reverse is also true. That is, there are matters accepted by the scientific community, but some people deny them. "The spherical shape of the Earth" and "Evolution" are clear examples.

Mr. Dawkins writes in the second chapter:

We all consider ourselves entitled to exercise our utmost skepticism, bordering on outright disbelief—of course, not about unicorns, tooth fairies, and Greek, Roman, Egyptian, and Viking goddesses, because (today) we don't need to trouble ourselves to refute these imaginary figures. [The God Delusion, p. 38]

I think we should say thank God here that no writings from the theism of "extinct tribes" remain that would fall into Mr. Dawkins's hands and be mentioned in The God Delusion! -In previous sections, from the book "The

Magic of Reality," we witnessed Mr. Dawkins's great fondness for one of the West African tribes.- We attach no importance to unicorns, fairies, the beliefs of tribes and neighborhoods thousands of years ago, or the "popular imagination" of people in various corners of the contemporary world regarding God.

After reading the sections Not only are some of the proofs for God's existence unacceptable, but some are truly ridiculous, The negation of the proof does not imply the negation of the proven, and Which God?, review them once more to understand this issue better. The popular conception has no importance for the scientific and research community.

Definition of Religion and Faith

Although Mr. Dawkins has not provided any precise definition of religion or faith in his book, and has proposed "made-up" definitions that are also unacceptable to us—whereas when someone refutes something, they should quote the sayings of its great figures or provide a source, and then subject it to criticism.— However, despite this, his definition of religion and especially faith is very unexpected, shocking, and distasteful. In his "definition of religion" on page 76 of The God Delusion, he writes: One of the truly destructive effects of religion is to consider being content with one's lack of understanding as a virtue. [The God Delusion, p. 76]

And a few pages later he says:

Religion is wasteful and extremely extravagant; while the habitual practice of natural selection is to oppose waste and eliminate wastage. [The God Delusion, p. 96]

On page 175, he defines "Faith": Christianity, just like Islam, teaches children that unquestioning faith is a virtue. You don't need to provide proof or evidence for what you have faith in. [The God Delusion, p. 175]

In The God Delusion, he forcefully tries to make us accept things that the mind of no rational and free person would accept. Whether his various definitions of God, religion, and faith, or his arguments and irrelevant digressions.

He has assumed that faith and religion are based on no reason or proof. And essentially, these two subjects include matters that relate to "human childhood"!
But well, I could also say the difference between atheism and Christianity and Islam is that it teaches not only children but also adults that they don't need to provide proof or evidence for what they believe in.

When we ask them: "What is your reason for the 'non-existence of God'?"
They say, according to Russell's teapot—which we will critique in the second part—you should provide the proof.

We say: "How do you know that there is no 'afterlife'?" They say: "Russell's teapot!"

Whatever we ask, they say "Russell's teapot." Of course, God forbid that this doubt arises in your mind that they are followers of a person! Of course not! Atheists use only their own reason! Anyway; what does religion mean?

Religion is usually defined as a social-cultural system of specified behaviors and practices, ethics, beliefs, worldviews, texts (sacred), and prophecies. [Religion, English Wikipedia]

What does faith mean?

Faith comes from the root "أمن" meaning certainty and peace of heart. [Maqayis al-Lughah and Lisan al-Arab, the word "أمن"]

Of course, the definitions of religion and faith are among the most difficult definitions. As I will say in the next section, doctrinal, cultural, and religious differences greatly influence the approach of religious people. And significant differences are seen not only between religions but also between sects of one religion. That's why I chose the definitions from these dictionaries because they are more general. These definitions do not mean at all that we believe in a religion formed without reason and proof. That is, alongside rational belief in the main framework, we will believe in matters that are at least "not contrary to reason."

Dawkins' demands, stances, and inappropriate expectations of God, religion, and sacred texts are very numerous. It would have sufficed if Mr. Dawkins had taken the trouble to do a little research in these fields and then campaigned against them. He writes in one of his books:

And atoms are far smaller than bacteria. The world is made of things that are unbelievably tiny, so small that they cannot be seen with the naked eye. Nevertheless, none of the myths or books known as "holy books" (books that even in the present age some people believe were revealed by God, a God who is all-knowing) have mentioned them! [The Magic of Reality, p. 52]

A completely wrong expectation of holy books! Pay attention to this hypothetical debate between me and Mr. Dawkins:

✓ Mr. Dawkins, are you familiar with and knowledgeable about the automotive industry?

- As much as I know, yes.

✓ Then why haven't you said anything about the automotive industry in "The God Delusion"?

- My boy! The automotive industry has nothing to do with the subject and content of "The God Delusion"!

✓ Then why do you expect that God, who has complete knowledge of everything, should have mentioned atoms, quantum mechanics, bacteria, and bacteriology in the Quran, which is about six hundred pages and a book with the content of guidance?

Religious Absolutism

Religious absolutism, or in other words, seeing things in black and white, is one of the fundamental problems of contemporary Muslims. According to this view, I am the only one who speaks the truth, and if you disagree with even a small percentage of my words, you are in complete error. Only my interpretation of religion—which they consider the truth—is correct, and you, who have several views that differ from mine, are a heretic and superstitious.

The absolutism of Muslims has dealt a great blow to the body of Islam. To the extent that one can say with certainty that one of the main reasons for turning away from and opposing religion in Islamic societies is this issue. Most of these religious people have no logic at all. And merely by citing a few verses, hadiths, and narrations, they label their opponent as an unbeliever and sometimes an infidel. One side, for example, says: "Subject A is the belief of the Quran, Islam, the Prophet, and all scholars, and anything else is contrary to the instructions of the Holy Prophet and Islam." The other side says: "No; subject A is completely wrong. Instead, 'subject B' is the belief of Islam and Muslims; the first side understood nothing of religion!"

And so, others, by raising more subjects, exclude each other from the circle of friends and believers. And they use phrases and terms against each other that even an unbeliever would not use for another unbeliever. All of them also cite the Quran and hadiths for their beliefs. But this issue is not that simple and creates fundamental problems. One of the biggest problems of this issue is proving contradictions in the statements of Allah, the Prophet, and the great figures, and more generally, the Quran and Islam.

Religious absolutists are very rigid-minded and absolutely lack the power and courage to say: "Subject A" or "Subject B" is the result of my own thinking, my sect, or my own interpretation of the transmitted texts, and they never allow that other interpretations might also be close to the truth. Or perhaps there are several "valid interpretations."

This issue also plagues Islamic preachers and missionaries—except for a few throughout the world! Of course, it can be imagined that this absolutism is injected into the minds of the laity by them. These are people who say: "Whoever accepts evolution is not a Muslim." or "No Muslim should reject intelligent design—we will discuss these two topics more together in the later sections."

Atheistic Absolutism

Religious absolutism is not exclusive to the religious. It is also abundantly observable among the non-religious. That is, they consider one viewpoint as representative of the entire religion, and after refuting that

viewpoint, they claim that the entire religion—or all theistic thinking—has been refuted.

Richard Dawkins is a "non-religious absolutist." He sees everything in black and white. In his books, he uses words like always, without a doubt, undeniable, everything, never, and no time excessively. [throughablogdarkly, 2014]

He believes that all the beliefs and convictions of theists are entirely formed from childish and illogical ideas. In "The God Delusion," he pretends that only his belief is rational and real. And all his opponents are somehow at a lower intellectual level. His style of reasoning is such that only I am right, and my belief is pure truth. To the extent that in the introduction to the paperback edition of "The God Delusion," he writes:
Religious readers, after finishing reading it {The God Delusion}, will be atheists. Of course, the sanctimonious are immune to argument. Their resistance is due to years of religious education and indoctrination from childhood. [The God Delusion, p. 13]

In the third part, I have included some views of scientists and philosophers—as Dawkins calls them!—who are rigid-minded regarding this book.

Religious Rigid-Mindedness

In a classification of beliefs—of course, this classification is separate from the section on various beliefs about God—believers are divided into a wide spectrum. The beginning of this spectrum is laxity, and the end is extremism. Neither laxity is justifiable, nor is extremism in belief or anything else acceptable. Throughout history, great religious figures and intellectuals have faced this issue and have always tried to prevent it.
But extremism seems like a virus in the mind that, after (incomplete!) understanding of religion, first spreads in the individual's own being and then throughout society.
All religious extremists are rigid-minded. But perhaps not all religious rigid-minded people are extremists. The reason might be that they still lack effective tools like money and power to "inject their mental virus" into society. Anyway, religious rigid-minded people have turned many away from religion.

Their sayings, actions, deeds, and clumsy behaviors have prepared the ground for defaming religions. Strange talk, or blowing oneself up in the market and terrorizing others, their injustices towards children and women, considering other religious people superstitious, are all signs of a religious rigid-minded extremist.

Professor Dawkins also has a long list of the sayings and deeds of these rigid-minded ones (who are not dear!). And he has attributed all these inappropriate and immoral matters quite emotionally—I deliberately chose this word—to religions. From the fifth chapter to the end of the book, Dawkins, very precisely, meticulously, and with excellent rhetoric, plants this idea in the reader's mind that because these rigid-minded people are religious, their belief stems from their religion.

Definition of Science

The "Cambridge Dictionary," which is considered one of the most reliable dictionaries, defines science as:

The careful study of the structure and behavior of the physical world, especially through observation, measurement, and experimentation, and the development of theories to describe the results of these activities. [Cambridge Dictionary, the word "Science"]

We can also refer to the English Wikipedia for the definition of science. "English Wikipedia," unlike Persian Wikipedia, is considered a good and reliable source.

A systematic subject that provides and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the world. [English Wikipedia "Science"]

Although I find the definitions not very acceptable. But the method and scope of science are completely clear. Richard Dawkins says several times about God:
"The Hypothesis of God" is also a scientific hypothesis about the world. [The God Delusion, p. 11 & p. 66]

He thinks that God must be something seen or at least felt within a telescope or microscope. And because eyes are incapable of seeing Him and human senses cannot precisely detect and understand the subject in question, he has named God a "scientific hypothesis." Earlier, in the section on Dawkins' Rejected God, we scrutinized this issue more precisely.

"Peter Medawar," a Nobel Prize winner in Physiology or Medicine, says about empirical sciences:

It is very probable that there is a limit to science, because there are questions that it cannot answer, and no progress in science will ever enable science to answer them. [The limits of science, p. 66]

Science itself has a specific framework and limit, and not every question can be answered by it. If we expect to answer every problem with something that is itself within a framework and limit—like the "existence of God" with the tools of empirical sciences—then incorrect answers and results will emerge. If I want to prove the non-existence or existence of various sound frequencies with a barrel of water, well, I certainly cannot. And after the final experiment, I declare: "The existence of sound cannot be detected by the barrel. Therefore, it is an incorrect hypothesis."

Not every scientist's word is acceptable as science.
In my opinion, this part is very important. Most beginner educated people, or those who follow scientific documentaries a lot, think: "Whatever any scientist says is in accordance with modern science. And opposing that scientist's view is equivalent to opposing science."

They, in order not to be against science, stamp their approval on every word they hear from Dawkins, Hawking, and the like. And they don't know at all that these words have been criticized or refuted by other scientists. Science itself has its own specific language and doesn't need a spokesperson. Therefore, if a scientist says something that is not in harmony with the language of science, without any ceremony—whoever it may be—and with all due respect to that person, we do not accept his word.
A little later, in the section on Richard Dawkins' Scientific Theories, I have quoted from top-tier biologists in the world who disagree with his scientific

theories, such as "Ernst Mayr" and others. So, the notion that whatever any scientist says is pure knowledge is wrong.

We accept a person in their own field of work and activity. Many people think that Dawkins, in addition to his mastery in animal biology, is also at a very high level in philosophy, intellectual sciences, and other fields. Someone wrote under one of my Instagram posts criticizing Mr. Dawkins: You are trying to ruin a person who has no rival in the entire world!

My dear! No rival in the entire world? In biology itself, many biologists are superior to him based on their books and articles. And when you read the second part of the book, you will realize that he is very, very weak in philosophy and intellectual sciences. To the extent that after reading the critiques, laughter will truly adorn your blessed lips.

Apart from this, he has turned matters that might only be correct in biology into a general worldview. He attributes the "evolution of living organisms" to the entire world and cosmos, and in a way believes in cosmic evolution, in the "evolutionary narrative." -Of course, without proving it!- Evolution itself has problems with certain laws in physics, and to reconcile it with some of these laws—like thermodynamics, which we examine in the second part—we need a forced reconciliation and an interpretation different from the biological narrative. For this reason, he has little familiarity with physics and its rules. And some of his arguments from physics and its sub-branches are inductive and incorrect.

We can only accept a person in a field outside their specialty if they are endorsed by scholars of that field. For example, although Mr. Dawkins has not studied the "field of philosophy," if many philosophers—most of whom should not necessarily agree with him—endorse his philosophical arguments, then he can be considered an authority in this area.

Evolution by Natural Selection

"Evolution" is a theory proposed by "Charles Darwin." This theory tells us that living beings did not appear instantly on Earth, but are the result of millions of years of "genetic changes and events" from other living organisms. This theory did not conform to the dominant theory of its time and is one of the ideas in the history of science that has greatly puzzled humanity.

Of course, alongside evolution, there is another biological law called natural selection.

"Natural selection," simply put, means that organisms that are most compatible with their environment will survive, ultimately reproduce, and be able to continue their lineage.

Modern evolution differs greatly from what Darwin proposed. The idea that humans are descended from monkeys is no longer acceptable to the current scientific community.

Mr. Dawkins himself explained this in response to the question "Why are there still chimpanzees?":

Many people ask me, if we are descended from chimpanzees, why are there still chimpanzees?

It's simple; we are not descended from chimpanzees! We and chimpanzees have a common ancestor, from which we diverged approximately 6 million years ago. It later split into two branches, one became us, and the other branch itself split into two sub-branches, bonobos and chimpanzees. We are not descended from chimpanzees; we are cousins. [YouTube, Richard Dawkins Foundation for Reason & Science]

In one of his recently published books, he said: We are cousins of chimpanzees; our somewhat more distant cousins are monkeys; our much more distant cousins are fish, and so on. [Outgrowing God, p. 25]

Some say: Because we and chimpanzees share about 98% of our genome, we are descended from them! Mr. Dawkins answers in "The Greatest Show on Earth":

This 98% genetic similarity between humans and chimpanzees, which is frequently quoted, does not actually refer to chromosomes or the entire gene, but to the number of "letters" of DNA, or, technically, to the "base pairs" that are identical in human and chimpanzee genes. [The Greatest Show on Earth, p. 440]

Anyway; a very important point to consider in the discussion of evolution is that not all biologists have the same understanding of evolution. Evolution in biology is exactly like "quantum mechanics" in physics. There is no interpretation or statement in quantum mechanics that is agreed upon by all quantum physicists. And there has always been an interpretation in quantum that some quantum scientists have rejected.

"Murray Gell-Mann," the prominent American physicist who won the Nobel Prize in 1969 for his significant work on elementary particles, says: Despite nearly a century of debate and experimentation, no consensus has been reached among physicists and philosophers of physics on which interpretation (of quantum mechanics) best explains reality. [Quantum Mechanics Interpretations, cited from English Wikipedia]

Or as Mr. Dawkins says in The God Delusion: Quantum theory is so strange that physicists grasp at contradictory "interpretations" of it. [The God Delusion, p. 208]

It is the same in biology. There are interpretations, exegeses, and hypotheses that one biologist accepts and another may not be convinced by. Evolution has undergone massive changes since it was proposed. There was a time it was thought that humans were descended from chimpanzees; with the discovery of cell structure and organelles and, most importantly, the "discovery of the structure of genetic material" (1953) and the infancy of genetics and the difficult issue of "neuroscience," or more recently (2013), the proposal of "Chromosomal X" and "Y Chromosomal Adam," according to which all humans are descended from one woman and one man, have sometimes confronted biologists with contradictory concepts. For this reason, when we talk about evolution, we must first define what we mean by it:

Which evolution?

This matter is not so simple, and of course, it doesn't require a specialized examination within the scope of this book. For any scientific theory, one can imagine atheistic and theistic interpretations and understandings.

In this book, we assume that evolution is a scientific fact. And that, in Dawkins's atheistic and stubborn narrative. Even by accepting this troublesome presupposition for us—evolution in the atheistic narrative—I still cannot understand how the "non-existence of God" is derived from it. Dawkins, without providing any reason why evolution means "the negation of God's existence," says:

I have constantly been amazed by theists who have not only not been enlightened in this way, but apparently become ecstatic about natural selection and consider it the 'divine way of creation.' They have realized that evolution by natural selection is a very simple and neat way to create a world full of life. There's no need for God to take any trouble! Peter Atkins, in the book mentioned, ... reaches the atheist conclusion that the supposed God is a lazy God who wants to take as little trouble as possible to fill the world with life..., Woody Allen said that the worst thing you can say about him (God) is that he is basically an unemployed being. [The God Delusion, p. 72]

Why can't God bring living beings into existence through natural selection?

What convincing reason exists that God should only choose a method of creation other than natural selection?

That is, God would not be lazy only if he chose a way other than natural selection?

The last point that Mr. Dawkins has endorsed is the same thing we have discussed in various sections of theology. Science is capable of examining the hows of the world; understanding more of the hows of the world cannot lead us to conclude that these hows—which are phenomena—do not need a creator.

Furthermore, God's intervention in the world certainly occurs through a series of events and occurrences. I, who am conveying my meaning to you now, do so through a certain method. That is the choice of words with appropriate semantic load. Now, a person whose field is literature can, by examining and comparing these words with more appropriate or less valuable ones, critique, examine, explain, or clarify this writing.

But from the fact that this person realized that this concept was conveyed through the arrangement of specific words, he cannot conclude that, well then, this writing has no real or true agent. Or argue that even if it has an agent, that agent is lazy!

God's method of creation, for example, is natural selection or another subject; from the existence of these methods, one cannot conclude the laziness or non-existence of the true agent. On the contrary, this proves the ultimate knowledge and creativity of that Unique Friend. Because He has chosen the best and most efficient possible method for creation. As "Richard Lewontin," a genetics specialist at Harvard University, whom Dawkins quotes and Dawkins himself also accepts, says:

"I think there is one point that all evolutionists agree on, and that is that in the natural environment of an organism, it is almost impossible to do better than what that organism does." [The God Delusion, pp. 96 & 97]

That is, a living organism, considering all the internal and external factors that can relate to it, performs the best possible system, state, and behavior that can be conceived and examined. -We will explore this more in the third part in the section How would the world have to be for Dawkins to believe in God?- But why is it actually in the best possible state—not ideal!—of itself? Why can't we even imagine a living organism not being in its best state?

Of course, this issue must have a scientific explanation, but why necessarily does it have this scientific explanation? Why hasn't it, for example, been placed in 60 or 50 percent of its suitable state? Why can't we imagine a possible state better than what it is?

The Relationship between Science and Religion

Many people have tried to find connections between science—usually meaning empirical sciences—and religion—meaning mostly Abrahamic religions. Religious people have wanted to bring these two closer together. Some religious people suggest a very close relationship between science and religion, exactly as if they were married!

And atheists are determined to prove that "science and religion" are like a sister-in-law to a newlywed bride! There are unresolved and ancient conflicts between science and religion, and they must be separated. Various books and articles by philosophers, theologians, and scientists have been published on this subject.

In general, we can divide the relationship between science and religion into two periods: before modernity and after modernity. Before modernity, science did not exist in the form we know today with its various branches like biology, physics, chemistry, etc. For this reason, it was mostly reason—meaning non-religious reason and some empirical sciences—and religion—transmitted sciences—that were discussed.

The best relationship proposed between science and religion before modernity was by Imam Ghazali, a prominent Islamic theologian. He divided people regarding the relationship between science and religion into five categories, which we briefly mention:

1. Principle only Sharia: People who do not consider reason as valid evidence at all, do not accept the interpretation of any religious sciences, and are extremely textualists.

2. Principle only Reason: They accept only intellectual sciences and from Sharia only what conforms to their doctrine. Exactly the opposite of the first group.

3. Principle of Sharia and a little from Reason: They adhere slightly to reason; Ghazali says because they have not delved into intellectual matters, they consider possible whatever is not proven impossible. As a result, they see no conflict between Sharia and reason.

4. Principle of Reason and a little from Tradition: Those who make reason the principle and mostly reject the apparent meanings of Sharia.

5. Principle of Both: That is, reason and tradition are together, and there is no conflict between them. Those who hold this belief believe that whoever rejects reason has also rejected Sharia. Because the basis of tradition and Sharia is reason. And according to

them, this group is the rightly guided sect. [Collection of Treatises, Treatise on the Universal Law]

Mr. Barbour, the contemporary Christian philosopher, proposed 4 relationships between "science and religion," which are often considered as the relationships between science and religion after modernity. And in various books, these relationships are discussed with revisions and reconstructions. These 4 relationships briefly are:

1. Conflict: Atheists choose science and become science-oriented, and religious people choose religion because there are many conflicts between religious and scientific propositions, and one must inevitably choose one.

2. Distinction: Religion does not have scientific issues and consists of theological discussions. Therefore, there is no similarity between religion and science, where science includes only scientific propositions.

3. Dialogue: There is a common ground between science and religion, and scientific-religious issues are examined in a collaborative and holistic manner.

4. Interaction: There is no conflict between science and religion; they support and endorse each other. Scientific activity is considered a religious activity. [Science and Religion by: Barbour - Religion and Science: A collection of authors]

But I do not accept the relationships between science and religion in different eras for two reasons:

✓ The precise definition of science and religion is not clear, and one cannot definitively consider a subject as pseudo-science or non-science.

✓ Instead of measuring science and religion against the world, let's measure the world against science and religion.

Of course, by "world" I don't mean only the observable physical world. Any possible world can be measured this way. Moreover, this new relationship

does not only examine the connection between empirical science and religion; it can determine anything called science, provided it is not religion and philosophy.

After we have defined our subject, we examine it through these relationships. These relationships are:

1. Nature: We examine the subject from a philosophical perspective.

2. Why: We look at the subject only through theology, without the interference of philosophy and science.

3. How: We examine the subject in question only with science and without sharing with philosophy and theology.

4. What: We look at the subject with a scientific-philosophical perspective.

This classification works like a machine algorithm; after defining our question's intent, according to the algorithm, we can understand which method and approach can provide the most accurate and best answer to our question. "Why" and "how" are two different questions about a single truth, which are often both answered by science and "how" by science-oriented people, and both are explained in favor of religion by religious people. Both are wrong. In this machine, where do you think a scientific subject—like evolution—fits (Nature, Why, How, and What)?

In the "How" section.

Well; where does "Creationism" fit?

In the "Why" section. In my opinion, creationism cannot even explain the how of the formation of the simplest cell. And this is not a reason for the deficiency of creationism. It is a reason for the separation of the domain of "why" from the domain of "how." "How" and now evolution cannot answer pure "why" questions. Even the "why" of the existence of a simple single-celled organism.

The "hows" of the world and scientific propositions are determined only by science and scientists. If evolution is refuted, it doesn't help creationism one bit; if it is confirmed, creationism has no relevance to the "how" of the world. Therefore, I agree with Mr. Dawkins's view: In short, instantaneous creation or guided creation... all these may appear as alternatives to Darwinism, but their worthiness must be judged by evidence. Careful examination reveals that none of them can in any way be considered rivals to Darwinism. [The Blind Watchmaker, p. 222]

Intelligent Design

"Intelligent Design" is a theory or argument according to which there are complexities in the world of living organisms and the non-living world that cannot be justified or explained by anything other than an "intelligent designer."

Mr. Dawkins strongly opposes this theory, and in various parts of the fourth chapter, he raises many objections to it. He first defines the theory, then mentions the biological cases that "Michael Behe," who with his colleagues reached this conclusion—intelligent design—and invented this theory, and the trial held in 2005 for Behe to defend his theory, all are included in the book. Of course, I agree with Mr. Dawkins on this and disagree with this claim and argument. It is quite clear that creationism is not a scientific proposition or theory. On the other hand, we cannot place intelligent design in the "how" box along with evolution or by excluding evolution, according to that new relationship between science and religion discussed in the previous section. Because from a series of "how" propositions, we have derived rulings and inferences of "why."

Intelligent design not only does not help us understand the world more precisely, but it also indirectly challenges theological concepts.

How can science refute the existence of God?

Science measures the hows of the world. It is surprising that in the postmodern era, some people, using a physics ruler with which they measure and examine the physical world, arrive at the non-existence of the creator of the ruler, the world, and physics. It's like someone saying: Because I know how this sentence was written, therefore this sentence was not written!

From the fact that science can explain certain phenomena in the world, we should not conclude that, well, God does not exist. But under what circumstances can science refute the existence of God?

If our definition of God is that God does not allow, for example, a living organism to evolve from another living organism, and we—after research and investigation—provide a concrete example of one having evolved from another, the meaning of this statement is that God's existence is refuted by science. Or if God has said that the Earth does not revolve around the sun, and science becomes certain of this, then God's existence is again refuted. As a final example, if God has said the age of the world is "six thousand years," and after examining the age of the world, we find that it cannot be six thousand years old, then God's existence is no longer acceptable. These are examples through which we can refute God's existence by science. If you've paid attention, we have never had a reason to refute the deistic God. That is, we cannot find a valid and convincing reason to refute the God described by deists. Of course, the God we believe in does not differ much from the deists' God. Mr. Dawkins himself hints at this point in his recent debate:

You might convince someone like me to be a deist, ...

Francis Collins:

Oh, your opinion has changed; I just heard that! (You became a deist!)

(Dawkins, Collins, and the host laugh)

Richard Dawkins:

Because of the fine-tuning argument. Later we suddenly say we believe in Jesus Christ, and then he was crucified, then we accept the resurrection, then we accept the virgin birth of Jesus, these have nothing to do with that (God, according to the deistic concept). My point is that this is a package which is probably a dishonest way of stuffing in what they (some religious people) actually want.

I don't mean you (Francis Collins). But some Christians want to bring (and make acceptable) Jesus or Allah or Muhammad or Buddha, or anything

else. You can't do that, I mean you need a proper argument. Or a really good argument for Jesus. But don't think that because you convinced someone with the fine-tuning argument that a God exists, he must therefore believe in Jesus too.

Host:

Certainly, that's right. [Biology, Belief and Covid, 2022]

Although his final statement contains a few errors, his point, contrary to what he said in The God Delusion [The God Delusion, p. 50], is correct. Deists also differ on God's attributes and characteristics. But overall, we all believe in a God who is Omnipotent and Absolute Perfection—as we examined in the section Which God?. However, refuting the God introduced by, say, Islam is also very difficult. Because understanding God's actions and words is not so simple. For this claim, I think there are four reasons:

1. Because the Quran is a literary book and uses many similes and metaphors. Therefore, the word 'perhaps' might be added to any scientific subject expressed within a religious framework.

2. Certainly, the Quran's purpose in raising scientific issues was not to expand on that subject, but rather to speak allusively for guidance and admonition. For this reason, our scientific interpretation of the text can be inductive.

3. There are very few "religious propositions" that speak about science.

4. Religious scholars do not have a uniform interpretation of all religious propositions, let alone scientific propositions, about which they have little knowledge.

But if we accept that God's word in a specific religion or sect is very clear, without metaphor or irony, and the scholars of that religion have a "completely uniform interpretation" of God's words, then by providing a scientific example—which I don't think would be very difficult—the existence of God is "irrevocably" refuted.

Mentality, Thoughts, and Beliefs of Dawkins
Knowing that Professor Richard Dawkins is an atheist biologist is not sufficient on its own. We must pay close attention to his type of thinking and worldview. What he thinks about or how he thinks, as well as his intellectual system and personal beliefs, are very important.
He is an extremely extremist evolutionist. To the extent that he has said in one place:

If you meet someone who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane... [theconversation, 2017]

He believes that evolution by natural selection explains all the complexity, wonder, and diversity of life. And there is no need for any creator, designer, or any other "principle or biological law."
Even in his writings, he turns evolution from a subject in biology into a "worldview." A worldview according to which if God exists, He must be the product of biological evolution and therefore must be very complex, and because He is complex, His existence is unlikely.
Any god capable of designing the universe, and carefully and foresightedly tuning it to lead to evolution, must be a being of infinite complexity and improbability, itself standing in need of a vastly greater explanation than the one it is supposed to provide. [The God Delusion, p. 88]

And he repeats this point many times in the book:
We can confidently say that if there is a God, that God too must necessarily be very, very complex and, of course, irreducible! [The God Delusion, p. 76, and similar arguments on pages 48, 68, 91, 92]

Of course, we have critiqued this argument in the second part and the fundamental flaws of Dawkins in the third part.
Alongside his specific worldview of extreme evolutionism, he is, in his own words, a "Darwinian" to the core. [The Selfish Gene, p. 275] He rejects the existence of anything non-material and is in a way a primary materialist. The moderator of one of Dawkins's debates says to Richard Dawkins:
I want to say that the fundamental problem with Richard is exactly this, that as a scientist and materialist, he will never accept a non-material explanation. Let us know that (whether) you accept only a material explanation for the material world we live in?

Dawkins:

As someone completely immersed in evolutionary science, I love the idea of explaining complex things with simpler ones. ... It is not easy for humans to appreciate the blessing of Darwin's existence. He showed us that the greatness of complex things can arise through a beautiful and understandable process of gradual changes. [Biology, Belief and Covid, 2022]

That he limits the vastness of the world to the world of living organisms, and all his thoughts and ideas are formed within that framework, doesn't seem very logical. "Comfort," a specialist in the history of biology, wrote about Dawkins in Nature magazine:
In his simulations, life is entirely determined by genes, which specify precise traits like growth patterns and color. ... Dawkins's critics accuse him of genetic determinism. [Genetics: Dawkins, redux, 2015]

The world is much vaster and larger than the field of activity and academic discipline of "Richard Dawkins." -In the section The Narrow Lens of the Academic Discipline in the final part, I have expanded on this fully.- If we measure all the world's subjects against Charles Darwin's intellectual system and his idea, we have not done justice to the matter.
I think Richard Dawkins's extreme evolutionism has prevented him from thinking correctly. Dawkins says:

The world we observe shows none of the features we would expect, there is no design in this world, no purpose, no evil, no good, in this world there is only darkness and ruthlessness. [brainyquote site, and Biology, Belief and Covid, 2022]

This negativity is very prominent in his philosophical arguments and interpretations. As I will say in the early parts of the next section, in the critique of the introduction to The God Delusion, "The God Delusion begins with illogical emotions."

Nobel Prize Winners

The 20th century was not a very favorable century for theists and religious people. And atheistic and materialistic thoughts were quite common in a coherent and effective way among the youth of society during this century.

So much so that from the middle of this century until roughly the 1980s and 1990s, any student who chose one of the "basic sciences"—biology, mathematics, physics, and chemistry—for study was expected to eventually become an atheist.

Nevertheless, in this century, the number of theists who have won the Nobel Prize is far greater than atheists. Below, I will detail the religious beliefs of individuals who won the Nobel Prize between 1901 and 2000. But before that, I draw your attention to Mr. Dawkins's claim: The desperate efforts of religious apologists to find modern religious scientists show their desperation, and one can clearly hear the sound of their scraping the bottom of the barrel. The only website I could find that claimed to provide a list of "Christian scientists who have won the Nobel Prize" could only name six people out of several hundred Nobel laureates. It turned out that of these six, four had not actually won the Nobel Prize; and at least one of them, I am sure, is an atheist who only goes to church for social occasions. A more systematic study by Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi "shows that the rate of atheism among those honored with the Nobel Prize in science or literature is significant compared to the general population." [The God Delusion, p. 63]

Mr. Dawkins's claim is not correct. Who were these six people and that one who was an atheist?

If we disregard his lack of sources—which is one of the ten fundamental flaws of The God Delusion—it is interesting to note that approximately 90% (from 89.4% to 90.3%) of Nobel Prize winners between 1901 and 2000 are religious. And 10% (approximately 65 people) are atheist, agnostic, or non-religious.

The most Nobel Prizes for atheists and non-religious people are not in the basic sciences; they have won more "Nobel Prizes in Literature." That is, 35%! [commons.wikimedia.org, Nobel Prize, 1901 until 2000]

These statistics are expressed very clearly and explicitly. But well; atheists like Mr. Dawkins suggest to their audiences as if "anyone who is a scientist is also an atheist."

If I give another example of Richard Dawkins's writings, in the first chapter of The God Delusion, he says: "Most contemporary scientists who

have said they are religious are actually atheists." When I first read that chapter, I remembered this humorous conversation:

- The ant's tail is very pretty.
- Ants don't have tails!
- They have tails; they just don't know it!

These scientists that Mr. Dawkins says are actually atheists are like an ant that has a tail of atheism without its owners knowing about it! Only the author of The God Delusion has become aware of this matter! Mr. Dawkins writes in the first chapter:

If we dig deeper into the beliefs of great scientists of our time who appear religious, we generally find that they are not religious. [The God Delusion, p. 17]

Of course, he borrows this argument from Bertrand Russell. As I will mention a little later in the section Richard Dawkins's Superheroes, Russell had a significant influence on Dawkins's personality. Russell mentions intellectuals in this regard, which Mr. Dawkins also quotes in The God Delusion.

The vast majority of intellectual people are unbelievers in the Christian religion, but they hide this unbelief in public, because they are afraid of losing their income. [The God Delusion, p. 61]

What wonderful intellectual people who hide their beliefs for fear of their income! But now this question arises for me: is Russell considered among the intellectual people or the unintellectual? Because perhaps he too is an intellectual Christian who, for fear of his income and fame, has introduced himself as an atheist!

I could also say: many intellectual people who are not atheists hide their belief, because they are afraid of losing their fame and position! Anyway; I have examined this issue in detail in the second part of the book, and there is no need to waste your time with these logically flawed matters! Dawkins accuses Einstein, who won the Nobel Prize and explicitly says "I am a Jew," that his meaning is not the Jewish religion, but a religion with a new

and unique worldview that Mr. Dawkins has named "Einstein's religion." The reason for much of the miserable confusion among people is that they cannot distinguish the view that might be called Einstein's religion from supernatural religion. [The God Delusion, p. 16]

I have dedicated several dozen pages in the first chapter to examining Einstein's theism and religiosity. And I compare it in detail with Richard Dawkins's statements. For now, we will leave this subject—until its appropriate time.

Dawkins's Presuppositions

Before writing The God Delusion, he had accepted many atheistic presuppositions in his mind, which he does not prove in The God Delusion, but rather passes over them superficially, in a few places in the book, and of course with reproach towards those who disagree, as if stating facts. We have elaborated on this in the section on the Mentality, Thoughts, and Beliefs of Dawkins.

Alongside these presuppositions, the book's language is "polemical, narrative, and rhetorical." And not argumentative with demonstration and proof. Whereas for such subjects, the book's content should be mostly argumentative. Of course, Mr. Dawkins has sometimes written unnecessary arguments as well, which we will deal with later.
The book "The God Delusion" was written for two groups:

The first group; atheists or agnostics who already have a background in the discussion.

The second group; theists who have very little religious and theological knowledge and are immediately transformed and bow down in submission by these quotations.

Theism Belongs to Past Eras

Unfortunately, most atheists think that theism is outdated, and in the postmodern era, there is no place left for rational belief in it. In their minds, scientific and intellectual progress leads us to the conclusion that theism and

belief in religions should be abandoned. In a word; theism is an old, rotten belief belonging to the past.

Mr. Dawkins, in his debate with Mr. Lennox on whether science has buried God, says about the reason for Newton's theism, the greatest and most influential physicist in history:

I accept that Newton was a theist. He lived in the 17th century, and everyone was like that at that time. [Debate: Has Science Buried God?, 2017]

That is, because Newton lived approximately four centuries ago, he was a theist. Or "Sean Carroll," an atheist physicist, said in a debate with "William Lane Craig," a prominent philosopher:

Once again, five hundred years ago I would have been a devout theist. Because that was the best we could do at that time. ["God and Cosmology", 2014]

One of the atheists wrote something on Instagram that I think is copy-pasted from a famous person, and I truly don't know who that person is: Any mind that has evolved is no longer a theist.

Well; it's better to return to Mr. Dawkins. He not only believes that if a person lived in previous centuries, he would be closer to atheism, but he also believes that as a human grows older, it is more logical to have left God aside. He writes:

Belief in God is like belief in Santa Claus; when we grow up, we put it aside.

He insults "Gregor Mendel," the founder of genetics, in The God Delusion, saying:

Mendel himself was a man of religion, an Augustinian friar; but he lived in the 19th century, and at that time becoming a friar was the easiest way Mendel could pursue his scientific research. [The God Delusion, p. 62]

This way of thinking—that beliefs contrary to mine all belong to the early periods of humanity, or opposing beliefs are childish stories—apart from being a distasteful insult, seems to me to be a high-level self-deception.

One can consider "New Atheism" as an updated and creative idea of past unbelief. But I have not found any new idea, even in its fresh interpretations. I do not think that atheists are people belonging to the past, or because the minority of Nobel Prize winners are atheists, I would even allow myself to say they have lower IQs. It is clear that they lack a correct understanding of some subjects, but they are studious and scholarly, and at least it can be said that they are generally more logical than traditional religious people.

Richard Dawkins's Superheroes

As can be seen from the writing style of The God Delusion, two figures have influenced the depths of Mr. Dawkins's thoughts. "Charles Darwin," the famous biologist of the 19th century, and "Bertrand Russell," the renowned philosopher and mathematician of the 20th century, both compatriots of his, have had the greatest impact on Dawkins. The personalities of these two are so prominent in Dawkins's mind and thoughts that it seems Darwin and Russell are recognized as the greatest prophets in history for him. For example, Dawkins said in an interview with CNN about one of his superheroes: Without Darwin, we couldn't be atheists. Because we had no acceptable answer to why a living organism looks designed. [CNN, 2012]

This statement of Richard Dawkins is like the word of a Muslim. Muslims also say, without the Prophet of Islam, we could not be Muslims. Because we had no answer to why we should be Muslim! It seems Darwin is like a prophet for Dawkins, who must answer all of Dawkins's scientific-philosophical questions and thoughts. Initially, I wanted to title this section "Dawkins's Prophets" or even "Dawkins's Gods," but due to the specific meaning of these words and the sensitivity they create in the mind, I found the current title more appropriate.

Bertrand Russell is the second superhero of the author of The God Delusion. From the significant influence of his Celestial Teapot on Dawkins's rhetorical language, which he discusses for several pages in the book, and other examples he adds to it, [The God Delusion, pp. 36-38, and 46] to the ontological argument that Russell accepted in his early life. [pp. 52 and 53] and the quote I mentioned from Russell in the Nobel Prize Winners section (The vast majority of intellectual people ...) and his defense of Russell's skepticism [p. 65] or his aphorisms [p. 175] and use of Bertrand Russell's

essays [216], all have played a role in the intellectual framework of Dawkins. If you have read "Why I Am Not a Christian?", you will notice the great similarity in arguments, views, and opinions of Russell and Dawkins. In the introduction to "Why I Am Not a Christian?", Russell has a wish: I wish for a world whose cultural aim is freedom of thought, so that imprisoning the young with the hard weapon of religious belief to preserve them throughout their lives against the brilliance of impartial reasons would not happen. [Why I Am Not a Christian?, p. 11]

This wish is the wish of all. Of course, in some countries like "North Korea," we must also condemn imprisoning the young with the hard weapon of the ruling atheistic ideology. But precisely this same wish is expanded in The God Delusion by citing examples of the evils of some religious people. Or on page 26 of the same book it says:

Fear forms the basis of religiosity. [Why I Am Not a Christian?, p. 26]

Part of this statement relates back to the God of the gaps. Some theists, because they did not know the cause of certain material phenomena like floods, earthquakes, meteorites, etc., for their own peace of mind, brought God or gods into the cause of those phenomena. And by calling these events divine punishment or similar things, they invented new religions for themselves. Yes; fear is the basis of this type of religiosity. But not all types of religiosity! In another book, Russell states that:

I think most of the effects of religion throughout history have been harmful. ... Religion has had mostly ugly and harmful effects. [The World I Know, p. 13]

We will analyze these points in their place. Anyway, when we read and examine the fifth chapter of "The God Delusion" to the end together, you will see these kinds of Bertrand Russell's views in the writing structure of The God Delusion.

The Scientific Theories of Professor Richard Dawkins

Richard Dawkins has a particular fame among biologists, biology students, and people worldwide. He has proposed three important theories that went viral like news. To avoid straying too far from the book's content, we

will not give a full introduction and comprehensive critiques, and after a brief description of what these theories say, I will briefly mention the critiques of several prominent individuals. Because I am not a specialist in this field, I do not comment on their truth or falsehood. Practically, for this part, I am an agnostic.

Dawkins's greatest gift has been as a lyricist. With phrases like selfish genes, memes, and extended phenotype, he has established many terms in new evolutionary biology. He has published a series of books that provide evidence for evolution, against design in nature, and for natural selection as the sole mechanism of adaptive evolution. [Genetics: Dawkins, redux, 2015]

These three theories are:

1. The Selfish Gene
2. The Meme Hypothesis
3. The Extended Phenotype

The Selfish Gene

Previously, evolutionary biologists believed that natural selection affects the group. But a biologist named "George Williams" rejected this with a theory, and according to his evidence and studies, he showed that natural selection directly affects the genome, not the group. Dawkins's theory of the selfish gene is derived from Williams's theory in the book "Adaptation and Natural Selection." Dawkins published his theory in a book, adding other numerous cases to it.

Therefore, according to Richard Dawkins's theory, genes—not groups—are the unit of natural selection. What most scientists have understood from this book is that the nature of the gene is its selfishness. But Dawkins himself does not accept this:

If we emphasize selfishness, it seems to focus on selfishness, whereas most of the book is about altruism. [The Selfish Gene, p. 6]

Where does the compassion of a charitable person come from? Is this benevolence incompatible with the theory of the "selfish gene"? No. This is a

common misunderstanding of the selfish gene theory. [The God Delusion, p. 124]

According to the selfish gene theory, the gene tends to preserve, survive, and replicate itself. And it eliminates any factor that prevents this. The gene does not do this intentionally or voluntarily, but it inherently has this characteristic: whoever opposes its interests will be destroyed!

Most biologists did not accept the selfish gene theory and raised many objections to it. One of the most famous books written in refutation of The Selfish Gene is "Deconstructing Darwinian Selfishness" by R. G. A. W. in 2009. Ernst Mayr, who also raised objections to the extended phenotype theory, in an article titled "The objects of selection," holds that a gene cannot act this way. [The objects of selection, 1997]

"Nathaniel Comfort" wrote in Nature magazine: The Selfish Gene is itself increasingly reminiscent of a twentieth-century structure. [Genetics: Dawkins, redux, 2015]

The ncbi website, one of the most credible sites in genetics and especially medical genetics, has announced that:

The selfish gene and neo-Darwinism are no longer sufficient. [ncbi, 2011]

Patrick Bateson, a biologist and emeritus professor at Cambridge University, writes:

Insisting that genes are the units of natural selection is like saying that the reason people buy cars is due to hydraulic pressures and other components of the car. [How a scientist Changed the Way We Think, p. 166]

Gabriel Dover, a geneticist compatriot of Dawkins, says in "Dear Mr Darwin":

It is better to describe the gene as a unit of long-term evolutionary change in allele frequency in a population. [Dear Mr Darwin, 2000 (cited from English Wikipedia)]

The Meme Hypothesis

Dawkins, in his book The Selfish Gene and its eleventh chapter, applies genes to organisms and memes to human culture. The characteristics and features of memes are exactly like genes. Let's continue this from his own words:

Examples of memes are tunes, beliefs, catchphrases, fashions in clothing, methods of pottery-making, and arch-building. Just as genes propagate themselves in the gene pool by leaping from body to body via sperm or eggs, memes propagate themselves in the meme pool by leaping from brain to brain; [The Selfish Gene, p. 277]

He generally uses this concept to explain concepts common among humans that persist in society. For example, he cites the concept of creation and asks how this concept has such a long history. How has this meme replicated? In answer, he says:

In a general sense, imitation is the replication of memes. [The Selfish Gene, p. 279]

He uses the meme hypothesis to explain why religiosity is so prevalent among people in The God Delusion. And he believes that memes are effective in popularizing religiosity. He cites many examples in the fifth chapter, which we will examine in turn. He repeats this concept of human culture, which he mentioned in "The Selfish Gene," once more in the fifth chapter:

Undoubtedly, many features of religion are entirely geared towards the survival of religion itself and the persistence of these features in human culture. Now the question arises: are these persisting features of religion more a result of "intelligent design" or natural selection? The answer is probably both. [The God Delusion, p. 111]

In Iran, this theory is very popular. And the term memetics has become established alongside genotype and phenotype. But the majority of the world's top philosophers and biologists also consider this theory invalid, and prominent individuals have written credible and bestselling books refuting it. Such as Mr. Robert Unger and Mr. Edmunds, who have respectively published "Darwinizing Culture" and "Three challenges for the survival of memetics" by reputable publishers like Oxford and Princeton University Press in refutation of this hypothesis.

Stephen Jay Gould, an American evolutionary biologist and paleontologist, writes in critique of this hypothesis: This theory lacks scientific evidence and standing. [Entry on Philosophy of Evolutionary Biology, p. 724]

Ms. Mary Midgley, a British philosopher who does not accept the "selfish gene" theory:

She has criticized Richard Dawkins's gene selection, memetics, and sociobiology as being overly reductionist. [English Wikipedia, The Selfish Gene]

Ernst Mayr says about memes:

It is an unnecessary synonymization that does not have the power to justify cultural phenomena. [Entry on Philosophy of Evolutionary Biology, p. 724]

The Extended Phenotype

Richard Dawkins explicitly wrote a book on this subject after writing an article under the same title. According to his extensive studies and research on some animals and birds, he concluded that phenotype should be extended to the entire genome in their environment, which can include behavior triggered by that genome, not necessarily inside the organism's own body. According to Mr. Dawkins himself, the most important service he has rendered to evolutionary biology is the discovery of this very subject. Ernst Mayr, the greatest evolutionary biologist of the 20th century, in his book "The Growth of Biological Thought," does not consider Dawkins a Darwinian according to this theory and deems it invalid.

I have included Ernst Mayr's critiques on these three theories because he was famous as the "Charles Darwin of the 20th century."

The Books of Professor Richard Dawkins

A television host asked Mr. Dawkins about his background and life, and he replied:

I was born in Kenya, a country in Africa. When I was 8, we moved to Britain. There I went to boarding school, then studied zoology at Oxford University. I was in California for a while, and a few years later, I returned to Oxford as a lecturer. Then I started writing books; my first book, "The Selfish Gene," was published in 1976. Since then, I've been writing books. ... I didn't come from a religious family, but the school I went to was religious. [Religious Debate, 2014]

So far, he has written 15 books. Professor Richard Dawkins's books in order of publication are:

1- The Selfish Gene. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1976.
2- The Extended Phenotype. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1982.
3- The Blind Watchmaker. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 1986.
4- River Out of Eden. New York: Basic Books. 1995.
5- Climbing Mount Improbable. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 1996.
6- Unweaving the Rainbow. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1998.
7- A Devil's Chaplain. Weidenfeld & Nicolson (UK and Commonwealth), Houghton Mifflin (US).
8- The Ancestor's Tale. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 2004.
9- The God Delusion. Bantam Press (UK), Houghton Mifflin (US). 2006.
10- The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution. Transworld (UK and Commonwealth), Free Press (US). 2009.
11- The Magic of Reality: How We Know What's Really True. Bantam Press (UK), Free Press (US). 2011.
12- An Appetite for Wonder: The Making of a Scientist. Bantam Press (UK and US). 2013.
13- Brief Candle in the Dark: My Life in Science. Bantam Press (UK and US). 2015.
14- Science in the Soul: Selected Writings of a Passionate Rationalist. Random House. 2017.
15- Outgrowing God: A Beginner's Guide. Random House. 2019.

All these books have not been translated into Persian. -Only 7 of these have been translated.- The content and subject of most of these books ultimately deny God. Even in books with scientific titles, this purpose is very evident. The literal translation of the above books is:

1- The Selfish Gene
2- The Extended Phenotype
3- The Blind Watchmaker
4- River Out of Eden
5- Climbing Mount Improbable
6- Unweaving the Rainbow
7- A Devil's Chaplain
8- The Ancestor's Tale
9- The God Delusion
10- The Greatest Show on Earth
11- The Magic of Reality
12- An Appetite for Wonder
13- Brief Candle in the Dark
14- Science in the Soul
15- Outgrowing God

The books that have been translated into Persian as of this moment, while I am writing this book, are:

1- The Selfish Gene (1976)
2- The Blind Watchmaker (1986)
3- River Out of Eden (1995)
4- The God Delusion (2006)
5- The Greatest Show on Earth (2009)
6- The Magic of Reality (2011)
7- Outgrowing God (2019)

The first three books from the list above, along with the sixth book, have unknown translator(s). The identity of the translator(s) for these books is unclear. There are also two translations for "The Selfish Gene" and "The God Delusion."

"The Selfish Gene" is the only book from the collection of Richard Dawkins's books that has been granted publication permission in Iran. "Professor Mahmoud Behzad" and "Shahla Bagheri" first translated this book into Persian. Professor Mahmoud Behzad passed away during the translation. The second translator eventually published the book through "Mazyar Publications." The identity of the subsequent translator(s)—or translator—of

The Selfish Gene, who later published the electronic version—which I have read—is not available.

"The God Delusion" is another of Richard Dawkins's books with two Persian translations. The first translation was provided by "A. Farzam." And the second translation, which according to its own statements mostly involved editing the first version, was published electronically recently. In the next section—The Translator of The God Delusion—I will continue this point. There is also another book not mentioned in the list above, "The Four Horsemen" (published in 2019). This book was not written by Richard Dawkins alone; he co-wrote it with three of the most prominent and renowned new atheists: "Richard Dawkins," "Daniel Dennett," "Christopher Hitchens," and "Sam Harris." This book is essentially a conversation between these four individuals, which was later turned into a specific book.